

The Classical Review

MAY 1905.

THE 'Retrospect' in the current number of the *American Journal of Philology* will recall to not a few that disagreeable adage of middle life *tempora labuntur tacitisque senescimus annis*. But in the present instance there is the tempering reflexion that the aging may be very slow. Almost a decade of years after the epoch at which, upon the principles of Mr. Osler, Prof. Gildersleeve had qualified for retirement, he founded by his own sole exertions this quarterly representative of American scholarship, and unabashed has remained for a quarter of a century its active editor. The signal services which he has thus rendered to the cause of learning in America and outside it are known to all readers of the *Classical Review*, who will join in wishing him a long continuance of his *cruda uiridisque senectus*. To this friendly wish we may add the hope that he will not allow the claims of editing and the seductions of 'Brief Mention' to delay much longer the completion of his Greek Grammar, the first part of which appeared in 1900, a work as highly appreciated as it is sorely needed.

Apropos of the *American Journal of Philology*, its editor's conscientiousness descends so much into details, that he will no doubt gladly furnish the clue to a small puzzle in the compilation of its book-lists. Why are so many of the English publications, including most of the important ones, transferred to the American list? The fact that my publisher has a branch or agency in the United States does not make my book an 'American publication.' I wish I could persuade the American Customs that it did. Bibliographically the practice is misleading. Thus in the last number the American list

NO. CLXVIII. VOL. XIX.

contains sixteen entries (including Jebb's *Translation of Sophocles* and Tyrrell and Purser's *Correspondence of Cicero*, 3rd edition) and the English list four, whereas the true figures are twelve and eight respectively.

The Council of the Hellenic Society has circulated among the members for consideration at the Annual Meeting a paper which contains two financially important proposals. The first, which every one will welcome, is to establish an Endowment Fund for the maintenance of the Society's work at its present high level. The second with the same end in view is to raise the life composition from fifteen to twenty guineas. At the present time the expediency of this is doubtful. Actuarial considerations and recent experience suggest that it may practically put an end to compounding.

Prof. F. Ramorino has sent us an extract from the Transactions of the International Congress of Historical Sciences in Rome (1903), containing an account of the MS. of the *Agricola* of Tacitus lately discovered at Jesi near Ancona, a third part of which goes back to the ninth or tenth century. Unfortunately, however, as Prof. Ramorino points out, the page photographed holds out no hope of the discovery adding anything to our knowledge of the text.

We note in answer to a correspondent that the *Greek Etymological Dictionary* referred to in our last issue is published by Messrs. Misch and Thron in Brussels, and the *Latin* one by C. Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung in Heidelberg.

THE PLACE OF THE DOLONEIA IN EPIC POETRY.

THE Doloneia is by common consent regarded as one of the latest books of the *Iliad*: and by equally common consent one of the most worthless from a poetical point of view. But none of the critics seems to go further than the supposition that the piece (for such it is, not an integral part of the poem) is by some late and inferior compiler, ignorant of the dignified usage of the Epic style. No one seems inclined to suggest that there is any other explanation of its many peculiarities but that of the incompetence of the author. Monro in the Appendix to his edition of the *Odyssey* (xiii.-xxiv. p. 378) lays stress indeed on the adventurous and romantic character of the book and the character of Odysseus as portrayed in it: he notes in it affinities to some of the later Epics in which similar adventurous episodes appear and in these epics he seems to detect, in one place at least, 'an unmistakeable air of comedy' (p. 368). But he goes no further and leaves his view of the Doloneia rather vague.

There can be no doubt in the mind of any one who reads the Doloneia through more than once that there is something unusual in the inevitable blundering which seems to be a characteristic of its author. *Nihil quod tetigit non inquinavit* might be his epitaph: and the conviction is gradually borne in upon one's mind that there is something here besides incompetence. What that something is, it is the object of this paper to determine.

When night falls at the end of the Eighth Book we find the Greeks driven in on their ships, while Hektor and the Trojans camp on the plain, ready to renew the attack in the morning (© 553 *sqq.*). So sorely are the Greeks pressed that Agamemnon sends an embassy to Achilles with offers of ἀπερίστρι ἀποῖνα if he will but consent to fight again. The end of I leaves Agamemnon face to face with Achilles' refusal and the prospect of an almost certain attack by Hektor in the morning. This situation fits in admirably with the 'background' of K: we find the guards who had been posted just before the πρὸς βεῖα (I 80 *sqq.*) still in their places in K 180; and though some ancient critics said that the book was sometimes placed elsewhere in the poem, it is hard to see what position would suit it better.

The book opens with a description of

Agamemnon's misery (1-24): he cannot sleep, groan follows groan as quickly as flashes of lightning or flakes of snow: they come 'from the bottom of his heart and his midriff (φρένες) quivered within him' (10). When the writer proceeds to tell us that 'he tore many hairs out of his head by the roots (προβελύμους, cf. I 541) unto Zeus upon high' we can hardly be in doubt about his intention. He wishes to make Agamemnon ridiculous, as Thersites is made ridiculous in B 265 *sqq.* The same device meets us in 93 *sqq.* where Agamemnon tells Nestor, 'nor is my heart steady, but I am distraught and my heart leaps out of my breast and underneath do my stout limbs tremble'; the epic mouth-ing only makes the facts more ludicrous. The same insistence upon the physical symptoms of fear meets us in the description of the hunted Dolon (375 *sq.*): he stood still 'quivering, and from his mouth came the rattle of teeth, pale with fear.' We feel that it is only the enforced dignity of epic tradition that spares us from a recital such as we have in Aristophanes' 'Frogs' 479 *sqq.*

To return to Agamemnon. In his distress he decides to go to Nestor and with him 'put together' (ρεκτῖναιτο) some plan for relieving the Greeks. He sits up and puts on his χιτῶν, his sandals, a tawny lion's skin reaching to the feet and seizes his spear. It is a sufficiently curious costume, but editors point to Paris and his leopard's skin (Γ 17) and are content. But when we find Menelaos later on with a leopard's skin round his back (29), Diomedes in another lion's skin (177), and Nestor in 'a double, flowing, purple cloak' (133) going about in the dead of night, we become suspicious: and when, to complete the colour-scheme, Dolon appears clad in the hide of a grey wolf (334)—the futile Dolon—we resent the attempt to pass this off upon us as serious poetry.

Agamemnon is not the only hero awake in camp that night. Menelaos is awake too, and imagining, like his brother, that he is the only light sleeper, thinks he had better go and wake Agamemnon. This crossing of purposes, two people doing the same thing, each thinking he is the only one who is doing it, is a distinctly comic touch that we shall find recurring. Menelaos goes and finding his brother awake and arming

expresses his surprise: is he going to try to get some one to go as a spy?; it will be hard to find anyone, *μάλᾳ τις θρασυκάρδιος ἔσται*. Agamemnon declares his intention of going to Nestor, but his confusion is such that he has forgotten what he wants with him. In l. 19 it was 'to put up' a plan: in l. 55 it is to see if Nestor 'will come to the sacred band of the guards, and give them a charge; for him would they hearken to above all men.' But what the charge is to be or anything else about it, we are not told. Meanwhile Menelaos is to wake Aias and Idomeneus and wait with them till Agamemnon comes.

Menelaos when about to start is given some advice which forms a very effective touch. He is told to wake the heroes 'naming each man by the name of his sire and his stock, giving honour unto all; and be not naughty in thy spirit, but let even us (*αὐτοὶ περ* our-elves) take trouble: 'tis for this, I ween, that Zeus sends upon us heavy trouble for what hath been done' (68 *sqq.*). Now, considering the way in which Agamemnon has comported himself all along, this is, to say the least of it, impertinent. His own language to Achilles in A is a model of studied discourtesy (A 173 *sqq.*). In his *ἐπιώλῃσις* he attacks Menestheus (Δ 338 *sqq.*) and Diomedes (*ib.* 370 *sqq.*) in the most unprovoked fashion: the most savage expression in the *Iliad* is put into his mouth (Z 57 *sqq.*), and his unbending and essentially discourteous nature is well shown in the two concluding lines of his speech when proposing the embassy (I 160 *sq.*)

*καὶ μοι ὑποστήτω, ὅσσον βασιλεύερός εἰμι
ἢ δ' ὅσσον γενεῇ προγενέστερος εὔχομαι εἶναι.*

That such a man should warn the courteous Menelaos not to be rude, is impertinence; but when he proceeds to include his brother along with himself as suffering for discourtesy and lack of geniality, it is more than impertinent: it is comical. Another comical side of his attitude to his brother comes out in his conversation with Nestor (102 *sqq.*). Nestor is inclined to blame Menelaos for allowing Agamemnon to wander about at night instead of doing it for him. Agamemnon's apology is worthy of Mr. Pecksniff. 'Aged Sir, at other times do I bid thee lay blame to his charge: often doth he lag and willet not to vex himself, not yielding to sloth or folly of heart, but looking to me and waiting for my bidding; but now etc.' The description of Menelaos is simply untrue, and would not be comical but for the air of superiority assumed by Agamemnon—who

had been tearing out his hair in handfuls a few minutes before in sheer terror—and his patronage of his 'harmless necessary' brother.

As Agamemnon approaches Nestor whom he finds *ἐνῇ ἐνι μαλακῇ* (Nestor is never unduly hard on himself), the old man half rises in bed on his elbow and calls out 'Who goes there among the ships through the host alone in the murky night? Seekest thou one of thy mules or one of thy comrades? Speak! Come not near me till thou speak! What cravest thou?' For the realism of l. 80 and the comical accent of terror in l. 85 (we can almost hear the words rising gradually to a shriek) we shall look in vain till we come to Aristophanes and Herondas. In the reference to the mules, the quiet humour of the passage becomes pure burlesque.

In reply to Nestor, Agamemnon begins (one may as well put it bluntly) to drivel in his best tragic style (88 *sqq.*): 'look upon Agamemnon, son of Atreus (*γνώσκει* is best taken as an imperative future) whom beyond all other men Zeus hath cast into troubles evermore, so long as breath remains in my breast and my dear limbs have strength'—he proceeds to describe his symptoms. He has made up his mind for the third time about what he wants from Nestor: they are to go together to the *φύλακες* and see if they are sleeping or not. Nestor replies by a vague prophecy of trouble for Hektor, when Achilles joins the army again, and agrees to go. After the interchange of views about Menelaos already noticed, Nestor dresses and goes with Agamemnon to wake Odysseus. On Nestor's summons he comes out of his tent, not unnaturally surprised to see the two heroes. He is told that the Greeks are in trouble and that he is to come with them—and wake some one else 'meet to devise plans to fight or fly' (147). Odysseus retires, reappears armed with a shield and joins them. This is a passage which has evoked an enthusiastic comment from Dr. Hayman (*Odyssey*, i. p. xlvii): he regards it as 'an admirable epitome of character.' That the cautious Odysseus should choose a shield and the bold Diomedes a spear (see l. 178) he regards as a master-stroke of *ἡθοποιία*. Perhaps:—but not in serious poetry; a device like this is the property of the comic stage.

The trio proceed to Diomedes' tent, and find him sound asleep. Nestor steps up and 'stirs him with a kick' *λὰξ ποδὶ κινήσας* (158) 'Wake, Tydeus' son! Why sleepest

thou heavily all night long?' We are not far from

ἄσθηθι, δούλη Ψύλλα· μέχρι τέο κείσῃ
ρέγχουσα; (Herond. viii. 1, 2).

Diomedes jumps up and (to put it colloquially) flies at Nestor:

σχέτλιός ἐσσι, γεραίέ· σὺ μὲν πόνον οὐ ποτε
λήγεις.

'Are there not younger men,' he asks, 'to go on such an errand?' 'There are,' retorts Nestor in effect, 'and you are one of them: so be about it': ἄσθησον—σὺ γάρ ἐσσι νεώτερος (176) is the cheap retort to οὐ νη καὶ ἄλλοι ἔασιν νεώτεροι of 165 which we should expect to meet in Comedy.

Joined by Diomedes and, as we must assume, by Menelaos and his party, Nestor and his motley crew come upon the sentinels. We are gravely told that they did not find them sleeping. We had not expected for some fifty lines back that they would. Nor did the author entertain any idea of the kind himself, and in case we should think he did, he lets us into his private opinion by a simile. The sentinels are compared to dogs watching by night over a sheepfold listening to the advance of a wild beast through the forest on the hill 'and loud is the din at his coming both of men and dogs and sleep has departed from them utterly' (183 sqq.). The noise made by Nestor and his party coming to see if they were asleep or not had effectually settled the question. Nestor cheerfully bids them continue as they are, crosses the trench and prepares to hold a council of war in a clear space on the field. When all are ready to listen, he expounds his plan of safety—to send out a spy to see what is going on! Nestor's mystifying methods of procedure, his mysterious hinting 'I know what I know,' and then giving some perfectly commonplace advice after an immense and laboured preparatory harangue, could not be 'hit off' better. A plain man who is a careful reader and asks questions as he reads can hardly avoid remembering the proceedings in Agamemnon's tent early that very night (I 90 sqq. 670).

Nestor's speech is enlivened by one sly sneer, which is as much a sneer of the writer's at the military situation which he found assumed at this point in the poem as anything else. The spy is to find out what the Trojans design, 'whether they are minded to tarry where they be, far off from the ships or retreat again to the city, now

that they have subdued the Achaeans' (209 sq.). The reward of a black sheep from each chieftain for the spy seems an unhappy proposal (Sch. A does the best that can be done to explain it) if it be serious (but on the view of the book assumed here, a very sly intimation of the fate in store for a spy) and it is called by an ill-omened word (κτέρας cf. κτερίζειν): and if we adopt Peppmüller's view of 217 'he shall be present in the songs sung at feasts' the further reference to posthumous fame makes the passage, in the circumstances, pure burlesque.

Diomedes engages to go if some one will go with him. 'It will be more comfort' (θαλπωρή) he says, 'and more encouraging': this from θρασὺς Διομηδῆς *donne furieusement à penser*. He hastens to add reasons for his apparent cowardice. 'It is a case,' he says, 'of "two are better than one," and "one man sees before his fellow"' (224). I take σὺν δὲ ἐρχομένῳ and πρὸς ὃ τοῦ ἐνόησεν as two proverbs: for καὶ τε cf. M 284.

The rivalry for the honour of supplying the θαλπωρή that Diomedes desires is evidently modelled on Θ 91-174; and Agamemnon's fear that Menelaos may be chosen is obviously a reference to Δ 148 sqq. where he shows such anxiety about him. In obedience to a broad hint Diomedes passes over Menelaos and chooses Odysseus. The latter takes his complimentary remarks very coolly εἰδοῖσι γάρ τοι ταῦτα μετ' Ἀργείους ἀγορεύεις (250) and the pair proceed to supplement the shield and spear they had between them.

Whatever be the view we take of the tone of the book as a whole there can hardly be two opinions about the point of 266-271. The lines are a deliberate parody of B 102 sqq. There Agamemnon's sceptre is said to have descended from Pelops, to whom it was given by Hermes, who had it from Zeus, for whom Hephaistos made it. The helmet that Meriones gives to Odysseus had been an heirloom from the time of Autolykos, who got it—by burglary from the house of Amyntor! (πύκινον δόμον ἀντιπορήσας: the word is found only here and in *Hymn Herm.* 178, a suspicious parallel); the parody extends even to details: cf. Θυέστ' Ἀγαμέμνονι λείπε φορῆναι (B 107) with ὃ Μηριόνη δῶκεν ᾧ παιδί φορῆναι. Could Odysseus of all men, and on this errand, have a more comically suitable present?

As the adventurers start on their journey Athena sends a heron as an omen (if Zopyrus' reading πελλόν be right in 275 it

adds to the point), which, as the poet admits, they did not see but merely heard crying, and both pray for success in the approved manner.

Meanwhile Hektor is not idle: he has on his part been doing precisely what the Greeks are doing on theirs. Now to send out a spy is a device whose success depends largely on the fact that the other side either doesn't or can't send out another. When both sides send out spies at the same hour over the same road, disaster is close at hand: and disaster that is sure to contain some elements of comedy. πολέμητις ἔδν πολυμήχανον εἶπεν is pretty certain to be the epitaph of one or other.

Hektor proposes a reward of a more substantial character than Nestor's. The spy is to get, if successful, the best chariot and pair in the Greek army. Dolon volunteers. The description of Dolon is a deliberate parody of that of Tydeus in E 801: the latter μικρὸς μὲν ἦν δέμας ἀλλὰ μαχητής: Dolon is one ὃς δὴ τοι εἶδος μὲν ἦν κακός, ἀλλὰ ποδώκης (316). Dolon too was an only son among five sisters, not a promising family history for a warrior. However his greed urges him on, and he demands that Hektor shall give him a definite promise of the horses and chariot of Achilles. Hektor does so with the words 'Let Zeus be witness . . . that no other warrior of the Trojans shall mount the team,'—the 'tragic irony' is obvious: ἐπίορκον ἐπόμοσε, too, in 331 may be intentionally ambiguous 'swore an oath to confirm' what actually happened or 'perjured himself' by failing to carry out his promise.

Dolon starts with extravagant promises to penetrate as far as Agamemnon's ship. He is not far on his way when he meets the others. Odysseus πρὸ τοῦ ἐνόησεν and proposes to let him pass first and then hunt him down. They lie among the corpses to wait and when he had passed them 'as far apart as the furrows ploughed by mules' they make after him. He stops when he hears the steps, confident that they were messengers sent by Hektor to recall him. The bold blade had perhaps been stopped before this on some *soi-disant* dare-devil exploit by the πέντε κασίγνηται. Recognizing his pursuers he gives them a good run and is only stopped at last when Athena gives Diomedes strength enough to come close up and miss him with his spear on purpose. Dolon stops in terrible dismay. He offers to ransom himself with the airs of a great man (cf. 378 *sqq.* with Z 46 *sqq.*, A 131 *sqq.*), but his offer is neither accepted

nor refused (Odysseus merely tells him 'not to let death get on his mind') till they extract information. In answer to the rather superfluous question whether he had been sent by Hektor or had merely come out of 'spirit' he throws the blame on Hektor. Odysseus is coolly ironical about Achilles' team and asks where Hektor is and where the guards are stationed. Dolon tells all he is asked, giving a full description of the camp and particularly of the position of Rhesos. He proposes in return that he should be tied and left where he is till they return, as a pledge for his good faith. He seems to think they are not likely to get back and that he will be found by his friends in the morning. Diomedes disabuses his mind of this idea (μὴ δὴ μοι φύξιν γε, Δόλων, ἐμβάλλω θνητῷ 447) and makes sure of his future in true Diomedean style. They take off his weasel-skin cap and wolf skin and dedicate them with his bow and spear to Athena. They hang them up in a tamarisk tree and to make sure that they won't miss them again in the dark they tie a knot on the branches of the tree with rushes! Not even an Abderite could have adopted a wiser method.

Dolon's news about Rhesos and his horses puts the pair on a new scent. Why not secure these famous horses?—a brilliant idea which is put into immediate execution. They decide to make the horses their objective and at last reach the post where Rhesos and his horses are to be found. It will be noticed that they make no attempt to find out what they had been sent to find out. It is true that in 409 *sqq.* Odysseus asks Dolon for the information he had come to get (cf. 208 *sqq.*); but Dolon ignores the question in his reply and Odysseus does not insist on an answer. It is unnecessary to obelize 409–411 with Aristarchus: they serve to emphasize the inconsequence and want of plan characteristic of every one in the book. We may assume then that Diomedes and Odysseus are henceforward intent only upon plunder, and plunder for themselves. When Odysseus catches sight of the horses (again πρὸ τοῦ ἐνόησεν) he is all eagerness to secure them. 'There is no use standing there with your finger in your mouth' is the homely English for οὐδέ τί σε χρὴ | ἐστάναι μέλειον σὺν τεύχεσιν of 479–80. 'Loose the horses or else do thou slay the owners and leave the horses to me,'—a preferable alternative. Diomedes goes at it ἐπιστροφάδην: as Diomedes killed each man, Odysseus caught the body by the foot and pulled it out of the way till they had made

a lane for the horses: finally he kills Rhesos; 'he was a bad dream to Rhesos' says the poet (as the Scholiast, rightly I think, interprets 496). Meanwhile, Odysseus looses the horses, and drives them out using his bow for a whip. Then he 'whistles' (*βοῶντες* 502—Schol. B makes heroic efforts to explain away the meaning) to Diomedes who was meanwhile pondering what was the most rascally thing he could do (*ὅτι κύντατον ἔρδοι*) to wind up. Athena comes to warn him that if he does not make off at once (Odysseus' whistle had been an unfortunate inspiration) he may have to retire at the double (*μὴ καὶ πεφοβημένος ἔλθης*): 'some other god, mayhap, will wake the Trojans' (511)—there is no telling what a god may do! Meanwhile the sharp-sighted Apollo (*οὐδ' ἀλασκοπὴν εἶχ' ἀργυρότατος Ἀπ.* 515—it is 'almost comic', notes Dr. Leaf, *ad loc.*) scented mischief when he saw Athena busied with Diomedes: that he had seen nothing before was only to be expected from a Trojan god. The best he can do is to wake Rhesos' cousin to see the slaughter when all was over. The Trojans raise an outcry, but the marauders are gone, riding bareback: on their way they recover the 'bloody spoils' of Dolon and reach the ships. Nestor is the first to hear them. 'Shall I tell a lie or the truth?' he asks (see δ 140 with Merry's note), and decides for the latter as they are on him before he can make up his mind. All are surprised to see the heroes: Nestor admires the horses in words that are a parody of those used to express his admiration for the heroes of old (cf. K 550 with A 262) and supposes that some god has given them to Odysseus. Odysseus assures him that a god could provide better horses than those (556 is a parody of γ 231). Then with a guffaw (*καγχαλῶν*) he drives them into the stable and has a bath and another drink—the third that night.

Are we really to regard all this as a serious attempt in the Epic vein, unfortunately marred by a few infelicities? Yet this is the view taken by the editors. Dr. Leaf, it is true, comments on 'something of a burlesque tone' in 84 and the 'almost comic' effect of 515, but they are isolated criticisms and of the nature of a reproach. Fries (*Homerische Beiträge in Beiträge zur alten Gesch. von Lehmann u. Kornemann* 241) says Den späten Dichter der Doloneia erfreute offenbar die Duplizität, die Symmetrie, der Konflikt der sich begegnenden Spione, ein komödienhaftes Motiv, fast an Menandrische Technik gemahnend: but this is the one light touch in his serious tracing

of the pedigree of the tale to respectable progenitors in India and Babylonia. But once read from the point of view sketched above, the inconsistencies and infelicities in the book become plain; and there are many more than have been mentioned. We have the play of cross purposes running through the book, the realism which meets us so constantly in the *Odyssey* (Immisch, *Die innere Entwickl. d. Griech. Epos*, 19 sqq.) and which becomes so prominent a feature in the comic *Mime*, the use of proverbs, and proverbial sayings, so marked e.g. in Herondas (see ll. 224, noticed above, 173 *ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἵσταται ἀκμῆς* (cf. Theogn. 551), 351 *ὅσον τ' ἐπὶ οὐρα πέλονται ἡμίονων*, a homely measure of distance explained by Prof. Ridgeway), the evident parodies upon well known lines of Homer (Aristophanes' use of this weapon of comedy against Euripides is too well known to need illustration), and the irresponsible or bewildered way in which every one in general seems to act,—all prominent features of Comedy.

The book is late, as its language shows (see Leaf's Introduction), and it evidently presupposes a knowledge of Homer in its hearers, as Aristophanes presumed upon his hearers' knowledge of Euripides. This will explain the uncertainty as to its place in the *Iliad*. But what is to explain the more than uncertainty that has obscured its intention? Perhaps had we more Greek literature preserved we might find that the Greeks were not such fools as they seem to have been when they admitted a book so miserable in its attempts to be Homeric (as the editors assume) into the Homeric canon. It got there, as a matter of fact, as the Hymn to Hermes won its place among the Homeric hymns. Still we have some slight evidence to support the view that the Greeks did not always take it seriously. Dr. Leaf in his Introduction points out that the story is sometimes represented on vases in a comic spirit, and concludes that 'in the sixth century the story was still fresh and popular and was treated as public property in a different way from the consecrated older legends.' The Scholia are not the place to which one would go for an appreciation of humour: yet even there we find something like a stumbling upon the right track. In commenting on 409, Sch. A remarks γελοῖος γὰρ ἔσται ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἥδη τῆς ὥρας προκεκοφνίας ἐρωτῶν εἰ μένουσιν ἢ ἀπέρχονται ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν; but having seen the absurdity, he obelizes it away: at 499 the same Scholiast says μμείται τὸ γινόμενον ἐν ταῖς παραχαῖς. Schol. B actually notes as Dolon proposes to

g
of
th
du
B
an

wh
mer
the
Mr.
app
rem
mea
at a

Bu
An
Th

are,
rate
coul
not
It i
great
Aesc
such
W
ment
is ad
leader
thus

'
Chor
Frem

1. T
Grenf
(Oxyrh
claim
Let us
one or
Pap.
contain

go as a spy (318) δοκεῖ διαγανακτεῖν ὁ ποιητὴς οἷος ὢν οἷους ἐπιχειρεῖ (!) ; but he makes up for this in his note to 438 τὸ σμικροπρεπὲς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἄκρως κωμωδεῖ ὅτι περὶ χρυσὸν ἐπτόχεται. But the curtain is only lifted for a moment : and these sleepy hints are all that the

Scholiasts offer to show that they were conscious of any absurdity in the book from beginning to end.

R. M. HENRY.

BELFAST, March 24, 1905.

NOTE ON AESCHYLUS AGAM. 1060-1.

εἰ δ' ἀξυνήμων οὔσα μὴ δέχει λόγον
σὺ δ' ἀντὶ φωνῆς φράζε καρβάνῳ χερσί.

According to the ordinary interpretation, which generation after generation of commentators follow with sheep-like fidelity, these lines are pure nonsense. To say, as Mr. Sidgwick for instance does, that 'the apparent stupidity of such a suggestion is removed on the stage by Clytemnestra's meaning gestures,' is really no explanation at all. Mr. Housman's well-known lines—

But if you happen to be deaf and dumb
And do not understand a word I say,
Then wave your hand to signify as much—

are, on this view, no parody, but an accurate rendering. What sort of gesture could be added to these words that would not make them more absurd than ever? It is not at the culminating point of a great tragedy that we should expect Aeschylus to make Clytemnestra drop into such a piece of fatuity.

Wecklein is apparently the only commentator who has seen that the second line is addressed, not to Cassandra, but to the leader of the Chorus. His note runs thus :

'σὺ δέ, weil sie sich von Kasandra ab zum Chorführer wendet, den sie auffordert der Fremden statt mit Worten ein Zeichen mit

der Hand zu geben, dass sie absteigen und in den Palast gehen solle. Das thut der Chorführer, aber wieder ohne Erfolg. Deshalb sagt er : Es scheint nichts anderes zu helfen als gewaltsames Herabziehen vom Wagen.'

Neither rhythm nor grammar however will reasonably admit of disjoining the two datives. The *καρβανος χερσί* is clearly the *gewaltsames Herabziehen* itself, which Cassandra must needs understand if she does not understand Clytemnestra's words. The Chorus-leader replies accordingly :

ἐρμηνέως ἔοικεν ἡ ξένη τοροῦ
δαίσθαι· τρόπος δὲ θηρὸς ὡς νεαιρέτου,

and moves towards the chariot to draw her out of it; not however savagely, as Clytemnestra suggests, but gently and with soothing words :

ἐγὼ δ', ἐποικτεῖρω γάρ, οὐ θυμώσομαι.
ἴθ', ὦ τάλαίνα, τόνδ' ἐρμύσας ὄχον
εἰκουσ' ἀνάγκη τῇδε καίνισον ζυγόν.

But at the mere touch of a hand on her holy body, Cassandra breaks out of her stupor with the wild shriek that sends the Chorus shuddering back. They do not attempt to touch her again.

J. W. MACKAIL.

ADVERSARIA GRAECA.

1. THE Homeric fare provided by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt in their latest volume (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, part iv. 1904) cannot claim the name even of *τεμάχῃ* : it is crumbs. Let us hope for more next time, and mark one or two points.

Pap. 685 gives us a scholion (on P 728) containing $\eta \kappa = \eta \kappa \omega \nu \eta$. The vulgate may

be intended, but it is as probable that the word bears the sense which *κοινή* or *κοινή ἀνάγνωσις* has in prosodical scholia, of 'current usage'—much the same as *παράδοσις*.

Pap. 769 gives a new variant in N 344.

νιδ
γηθησ] εἰελ. [

The reading superscribed is the ordinary one, γηθήσειεν ἰδών. The original can hardly have been anything but γηθήσειε λάων. We thus obtain an instance of this verb from the *Iliad*—otherwise it occurs in the *Odyssey* and the *Hymns*—, and a confirmation of the usual and non-Aristarchean interpretation.

Pap. 773. β 340. I hazard the suggestion that [δ[. . .]ο which is above the last word of 341 may represent ἡδὲ ποτοῖο, an absurd variant on ἡδυνότοιο which occurs ο 507.

2. Aeschylus P. V. 436.

Ἀραβίας τ' ἄρειον ἄνθος.

With the scholiast, we are all shocked at Arabs near Caucasus, but it is a case for interpretation, not excision, as Strabo says (33, 41, 784) defending the similar difficulty Αἰθιοπίας θ' ἰκόμην καὶ Σιδονίους καὶ Ἑρεμβούς δ 84, where many read Ἑρεμνούς or even Ἀραβίας τε. The geographer remarks αἰτιῶσθαι δὲ βέλτιον τὴν τοῦ ὀνόματος μετάπτωσιν πολλὴν καὶ ἐπιπόλαιον οὖσαν ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι. We now learn from M. Bérard (*Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssee* ii. 88) that Ἑρεμβούς is in fact an alternative transliteration of the same Semitic word which gave Ἀραψ.

566. ᾧ τὸ φωτῶν
ἀλαὸν γένος ἐμ-
πεποδισμένον;

λείπει ἔστω schol. Reluctance to believe this has led to various supplements. The construction is not unfrequent in the good period. I wish to add *Herod.* iii. 14 (καὶ ταῦτα ὡς ἀπενειχθέντα ὑπὸ τούτου, εὖ δοκεῖν σφί εἰρήσθαι) to the exx. given by Sikes and Willson and also on *h. Apoll.* 335.

1096. οὐ γὰρ δὴ πον | τοῦτό γε τλητὸν παρίσσυρας ἔπος say the Chorus to Hermes when he advises them to escape in time. Apparently they consider the advice an impertinence: 'you have dragged in this remark by the head and shoulders.' Messrs. Sikes and Willson say this sense is not found in παρασύρειν; but it is in παρέλκειν; Aristophanes said Εὐπολὶς μὲν τὸν Μαρικᾶν πρῶτιστον παρείλκυσε, of his impudent theft; and we have the curious neuter use of παρέλκει = 'it is superfluous,' in grammarians' Greek.

3. Scholia on Sophocles' *Electra* (ed. Pappageorgius 1888).

28. Δι' ἔση. Certainly not Δίδυμος, as M. Schmidt imagined, nor is the χ the *chiamata* for which it is sometimes employed. Since

δ', both here and *Ajax* 1225, introduces a variant, it is obviously διχῶς, as the lamented Kaibel took it. The word is of course part of the technical vocabulary of ancient criticism. Though it appears not to be found in the Euripidean scholia, it occurs in the Aristophanean. If a proper name had been wanted, it would have been Dicaearchus.

78. Pappageorgius is probably right in interpreting π as τούτου or τούτων, although the abbreviation is contrary to the usage of the scribe of the scholia. However as the scribe has put a sign equivalent to ζῆται in the margin, there can be no error on his part, but probably a faithful copying of an archetype, in which, as is the case with praeminuscul MSS., abbreviation was simple and trenchant.

The normal meaning of π in this MS. is τισιν, as at v. 102, where the accent ἐπ' shews what the scribe meant, and there is no ground for imagining, with Jahn, a mistake for ἐν τῷ ὑπομήματι. At v. 232 after the same ἐπ' an οὐ in ligature has been erased. The wasp-like shape of the ligature and the breathing are perfectly visible in the facsimile. The accent on κείται shews that no preposition (*e.g.* ὑπὸ) has perished. The scribe automatically wrote the familiar οὐ κείται, and then found it was not the case for that formula.

4. *Iphigenia in Tauris*. The publication of the second volume of Mr. Murray's Euripides (Oxford, *no date*) has relieved me of a long paper which I once wrote to cleanse this play of the barnacles of criticism. My University prescribes this text, and since in Philology for good and evil we are largely sheep, our charges are likely to be free from a vast quantity of Baboo Greek. For this they may thank Mr. Murray. —On a few points I still find something to say.

208. ᾧ μνασθευθεῖς' ἐξ Ἑλλάνων
ἂν κτλ.

τῷ μνασθευθεῖσα' ζ M. after Elmsley, but it is just these small changes of construction that cannot be made. Read ᾧ; it is a case of the construction referred to above P. V. 566. There is another instance of it in this play in v. 194. German relative sentences give an analogy.

465 ἄς ὁ παρ' ἡμῖν νόμος οὐχ ὁσίας
Ἑλλῃσι διδοὺς ἀναφαίνει.

Ἑλλῃσι διδοὺς can barely be translated.

Δοθείς is inadmissible. I will hazard a conjecture in which I do not believe, but which is the best so far: viz. νόμον, sc. ὁ παρ' ἡμῖν 'Ἑλλῃσι νόμον διδούς, 'our lawgiver.' The present participle seems quasi-idiomatic in this phrase: Demosth. 18. 6, 19. 7, 22. 11, 23. 27 bis, and cf. Plato, *Cratylus* 416 B, 419 A, though the aorist also is found.

579 ἀκούσατ'· ἐς γὰρ δὴ τιν' ἤκομεν λόγον
ἰμὴν τ' ὄνησιν, ὧ ξένοι, σπονδῆς ἅμα
κάμοι.

Σπονδῆς is difficult to construe, and Mr. Murray rightly puts Musgrave's σπεύδουσ' in his apparatus. Qu. the correction of L, σπουδαῖς? She has come to a topic which contains, for her and them alike, ὄνησις + σπουδαί, comfort together with trouble. For the plural the Lexx. give *Ion* 1061. H = ai needs no demonstration.

633 ξανθῷ τ' ἐλαίῳ σῶμα σὸν κατασβέσω.

The sense of the verb is difficult; it must I suppose mean quench, stifle, smother, sc. 'coat'—so that if alive the man would be smothered. There is no near use of the word—Nonnus 29. 268 ἰχθῶρα νεύσσοντον ἰσβησεν οὖνφ is faintly similar: Plato *Cratylus* 112 c uses ἀποσβέννυμι of a spring choked by an earthquake and κατασβέσται is used of oil, in a different connection, *Protag.* 334 c: ἐτοῦffer is a kitchen term. Oil was used for embalming: Aelian *V.H.* 13. 3, Strabo 198. The process of course would be applied to Orestes between his execution and his burning. Nothing would come out of the fiery chasm.

914 φίλα γὰρ ἔσται πάντ' ἐμοί. 'I shall like it all.' She expresses her determination to have all the news before she deals with the situation. In so doing she interprets the feelings of the audience and of Euripides: the like artless device for more talk in *Phoen.* 383. The future therefore seems sound.

966 ψήφους διηρίθμῃσε Παλλὰς ὠλένη.

Why is ὠλένη suspect? The poet sees Athena's stout arm at work, as in the *Knights* 1169 she stirred the soup τῇ χειρὶ τῆλεφαντίνῃ. *Phoen.* 1375 may be added to Mr. Murray's parallels.

1142 sq. χοροῖς δ' ἑσταίην ὅθι καὶ
παρθένος εὐδοκίμων γάμων
παρὰ πόδ' εἰλίσσουσα φίλας
ματρὸς ἡλικὸν θιάσους κτλ.

It is a real comfort to have this passage restored to sanity. The usual emendations accepted the idea of a maiden of a good

Argive family dancing a violent skirt-dance at a wedding! The occasion was of course domestic, like the dance described by Eubulus ἐν Ἀγκυλίῳ (Kock II. 165). *Εὐδοκίμων γάμων* is gen. of quality: 'a fine match.' Cf. *Phoen.* 59.

1193 θάλασσα κλύζει πάντα τὰνθρώπων κακά.

This verse, a motto for Venice, is primarily literal. Seawater played a great part in ritual: Dittenberger, *Syll.* 617. 22, 877. 15, etc.

1223 [ὄρω] καὶ θεῶς κόσμους νεογνοὺς τ' ἄρνας. Mr. Murray has turned out one of the quaintest conjectures ever made—μόσχους for κόσμους. The latter word of course is technical: the κόσμος of a god was his clothes, jewels, etc., his wardrobe. See Homolle in Daremberg and Saglio s.v. *Donarium*: *B.C.H.* 14. 407 ο κόσμος ο του αγαλματος του την ερειαν εσθητα εχοντος. On the clothing of statues see Frazer, *Pausanias*, ii. p. 574-6 (a reference I owe to Miss Penrose): Dittenberger, *Syll.* 553. 41 ξαίνα παντων των δωδεκα θεων εν εσθησιν ὡς καλλισταις.

A feeling that κόσμος ought to be singular has influenced views of this passage. The feeling rests partly on the analogy of *mundus*, and is not justified. Cf., whether literally or metaphorically, Aesch. *Ag.* 1271, Isocr. ix. 9, *Phaedo* 114 E, *Protag.* 322 C, *Laus* 800 E, *Alcib.* i. 123 C, Phrynichus in *Anec. Bekk.* i. p. 18, 23.

1351 οἱ δὲ κλίμακας | σπεύδοντες ἦγον διὰ
χερῶν πρυμνήσια.

κλίμακες are gangways for landing: called ἀποβάθραι or κλιμακίδες in nautical inscriptions; Torr, *Ancient Ships*, 101, 102. The πρυμνήσια are the ropes by which they are worked: Orpheus, *Argon.* 359

ἐκταδίους ὅπλοις δῆσαι πάρα κλίμακα μακρήν.

1462 ἀμφὶ σεμνὰς . . . κλίμακας | Βραν-
ρωνίας.

Since Mr. Murray has thought Pierson's λείμακας worth mentioning, it may be well to defend κλίμακας in this local sense by Diod. xix. 21 (quoted by Mr. England) and *Atth. Mitth.* viii. 20 ἀντιφερον δημοκλεους εκ κλειμακων. The Lexx. give κλιμακώδης from Strabo.

5. *Knights*, 631.

κάβλεψε νᾶπν καὶ τὰ μέτωπ' ἀνέσπασεν.

Crates, ap. Seleucum in Athen. 366 F found κάβλεπε σίναπν in his text, and blamed Aristophanes for using the form.

It has not been noticed that this very early variant in the Aristophanic text is probably graphical. ΚΑΒΛΕΠΕΝΔΠΥ easily gave ΚΑΒΛΕΠΕCINΔΠΥ. The fashion of writing ΠC for ψ, ΧC for ξ is common in inscriptions and has left some

traces in MSS. A well-known instance shews this: *Poetics* c. 21.

μία γίνεται ἀμφοτέρων ὀψ,

for ψ the MSS. give us ησ, that is ΠC.

T. W. ALLEN.

NOTES ON DEMOSTHENES. III.

31. 14 ὃν μόνον ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ τῆς ἐπωβελίας ἄξιον ἦν κινδυνεύειν.

As a genitive seems not to be found elsewhere with κινδυνεύω, the conjecture may be hazarded that a substantive on which it depended has been lost. We find elsewhere κινδυνον κινδυνεύειν and κινδύνημα κινδυνεύειν, and such a word would easily drop out near the verb, e.g. immediately after it. Or περί may be missing. The genitive with φεύγειν etc. is not parallel, because there was of course no ἐπωβελίας δίκη.

34 arg. (*ad finem*). ἐκεῖ μὲν <ῆ> ἐκατέρου διαστολῇ φανερά.

The similarity of ν and η (N and H) often leads to error.

37. 4 ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις <τοῖς> ἐν Μαρωνείᾳ?

53 τινάς . . . οἱ τὸ πρᾶγμα τέχνην πεποιημένοι μήτε συγγνώμης μήτ' ἄλλου τινός εἰσιν ἄλλ' ἢ τοῦ πλείονος.

Here again the genitives seem unaccountable, and something may be missing, e.g. μήτ' ἄλλου τινὸς <ῆττους> εἰσίν, if συγγνώμης ἥττων could stand.

41. 11 φιάλην μὲν γὰρ λαβόντες . . . καὶ θέντες ἐνέχυρα μετὰ χρυσίων, οὐκ ἀνετηνέχασιν κεκομισμένοι ταύτην . . . σκηνὴν δ' ἦν ἔχουσιν, οὐδὲ γὰρ ταύτην λαβόντες ἀναφέρουσιν.

It would be hard to interpret σκηνήν here; but, when we come to 27 παρὰ τοῦ Λεωκράτους ἔχουσιν τὰ χρυσία καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια τῇν γυναῖκα ἔλαβεν and compare 59. 35 ὅσα ἦν αὐτῇ . . . περὶ τὸ σῶμα ἱμάτια καὶ χρυσία, we see it to be unnecessary, as σκηνήν is an easy error for σκευήν, to which ἱμάτια directly points.

44. 17 σκέψασθε ὡς πολλοστὸς εἰς τὴν τοῦ Ἀρχιμάδου συγγένειαν προσήκων.

The nominative πολλοστός seems questionable. Perhaps πολλοστῶς, as in *Ar. Eth.* 10. 5. 1176 a 29 δευτέρως καὶ πολλοστῶς.

45. 59 See *Journal of Philology* 13, 98, where I suggested ἔνεκα τῶν for κακῶν.

In 42 Reiske's μίσθωσιν for μίσθωσις and in 53 Cobet's τὰ τῆς φύσεως δίκαια (for οἰκεία) should surely be adopted. With the latter cf. *Gorgias* 484 A ἐξέλαμψε τὸ τῆς φύσεως δίκαιον.

68 ὀκνήσειεν τις ἂν προσελθεῖν πρῶτον.

Should not πρῶτον be πρότερος?

47. 4 ἀναγκάζει for ἀναγκάζοι?

48. 7 περὶ ὃν οὗτος ἡξίου ἑαυτῷ εἶναι. ἑαυτοῦ?

53. 1 οὐδ' αὖ οὕτως ἄπορος ἦν οὐδ' ἀφίλος ὥστ' οὐκ ἂν ἐξευρεῖν τὸν ἀπογράφοντα.

This is well known as one of two passages in Demosthenes, where οὐ is joined with an infinitive after ὥστε not in *oratio obliqua*. The other passage I have dealt with before (see in vol. xvii. 148 my note on 9. 48). Here I should suggest οὐκ ἂν ἐξηγῶν or οὐκ ἂν <εἶχον> ἐξευρεῖν.

54. 6 ἵν' εἰδῇθ' ὅτι, ᾧ προσήκε τοῖς τὸ πρῶτον ἀμαρτηθεῖσιν ἐπιτιμᾶν, οὗτος αὐτὸς πρότερος πολλῷ δεινότερος γασται.

For πρότερος (said by Paley and Sandys to mean *as a ringleader*, which cannot be the case) Dionysius gives πρὸς τούτοις, but that does not harmonise really well with πολλῷ δεινότερα: we should rather expect ἄλλα καὶ δεινότερα. Can πρότερος be a mistake for ὑστερον? ὑστερος could not, I think, stand. Possibly ὑστερον <οὐ> πολλῷ. That χρόνῳ δ' ὑστερον οὐ πολλῷ follows within a line or two is hardly an objection, as the reading of the evidence comes in between.

20 ἰθύφαλλοί τινες ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς συνειλεγμένοι, καὶ ἐρῶντες οὓς ἂν ἡμῖν δόξῃ παῖομεν καὶ ἀγχομεν.

The connexion of ἐρῶντες with the verbs

seems 'grotesque. Perhaps *ἰδιόφαλλοι* . . . *συνειλεγμένοι καὶ ἐρώντες*, <καὶ> οὓς ἂν κ.τ.λ.

56. 10 *πυθόμενος τὰς τιμὰς τὰς ἐνθάδε τοῦ σίτου καθεστηκυίας*.

The words *τοῦ σίτου* seem out of their proper place. Are they not an adscript from 9 above, *αἱ τιμαὶ τοῦ σίτου ἐπ' ἔλαττον ἐβαδίζον*? Or should we read *τῷ σίτῳ*?

16 *ταῦτα δ' ἡμῶν λεγόντων . . . καὶ ἀξιούντων Δ. τουτονὶ τὴν μὲν συγγραφὴν μὴ κινεῖν . . . τῶν δὲ χρημάτων ὅσα μὲν αὐτὸς ὁμολογεῖ ἀποδοῦναι ἡμῖν, περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων ὡς ἐτοίμων ὄντων κριθῆναι . . . οὐκ ἔφη προσέχειν Δ. τούτων οὐδενί*.

Kennedy follows Schäfer in taking *ἐτοίμων* as neuter and translating it *certain*, as against Reiske who says it is *positum in bivio* and = *ἀξιούντων ἡμῶν Δ. κριθῆναι* (*id est ἑᾶν κριθῆναι*), ὡς ἐτοίμων ἡμῶν ὄντων κριθῆναι. No doubt Reiske is right in making the word masculine. Omit ὡς as having arisen from the *ων* preceding, and all difficulty disappears, *ἐ. ὄντων* being parallel to *ἀξιούντων*.

προσέχειν should be *προσέξιν*. [In Blass' text *κἂν* just below is apparently a misprint for *κἂν*.]

57. 7 *τὸ γὰρ εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ πᾶν πάντα λέγειν τοῦτ' ἐγὼ ὑπολαμβάνω, ὅσα τις . . . πέπονθ' ἀδικῶς ἐπιδείξει*.

I do not see how these two things can be identical. Read *τοῦ γάρ*.

44 Blass is certainly wrong in adopting *ψηφίσασθε* from Lambinus without any MS. authority and leaving the nominative *μηδεὶς* κ.τ.λ. without construction. What Schäfer says is perfectly true, I think, that *μηδεὶς* really stands for *τις*. *τις* has become a negative under the influence of the *μηδενί* following it and of the tendency to double and emphasise a negation. *εἴ τις, μηδενί* τούτων *ἀμφισβητῶν* . . ., *ψηφίσαιτο* is what the orator had in his mind.

59. 105 *ἔπειτα τοὺς δοκιμασθέντας ἀναγραφῆναι ἐν στήλῃ λιθίῃ καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει παρὰ τῇ θεῷ*.

στήναι?

61. 43 *καίτοι τινὲς ἤδη καὶ δι' εὐτυχίαν πραγμάτων γυμνασθέντες ἐθανύμασθησαν*.

As in 31. 14 and 37. 53 above, so here the genitive seems to have lost the word which governs it, though here possibly the error may be different. A few lines before we have *τὴν μὲν ἐκ τῶν πράξεων ἐμπειρίαν*

γυγνομένην, which suggests *πραγμάτων* <ἐμπειρία> *γυμνασθέντες* or something similar.

54 *δι' ἃ δεῖ σε τῶν ἐπαίων ἄξιον εἶναι δόξαντα κάμει τῆς σῆς φιλίας ἀνεπιτήμητον ποιεῖν*.

Again a dubious genitive. Any real parallel can only be found in poetry, e.g. *ἄθικτος ἡγήτηρος. τῆς σῆς φιλίας* <ἐνέκ'> *ἀνεπιτήμητον*?

Prooem. 2. 3 *τὸ δὲ μὴδ' ὅτι οὐκ ἀντιλαμβάνειν τὸν δῆμον ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀντιπράττοντας περιεῖναι* κ.τ.λ.

The drift of the whole passage seems to require some such word as *ἀεὶ* or *πάντως* with *περιεῖναι*.

26. 3 *ἀθῶους τοὺς κινδύνους ποιήσουσιν αὐτοῖς*.

Such a use of *ἀθῶος* is unparalleled. Should we read *ἀθῶους τοῦ κινδύνου ποιήσουσιν αὐτούς*?

29. 3 *τοῦτο δὲ, τοῦτο*.

Reiske was practically right in *τοῦτο δὲ ταυτό*, but the regular order is *ταὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο*.

33. 2 *οὐδ' ἐπὶ τῷ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς μὴ δυνήσεσθαι θαρρεῖν ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ κἂν δύνωνται κρατῆσειν*, and 3 *ἐγὼ δ' οὐκ ἀποτρέψομαι λέγειν ἃ δοκεῖ μοι, καίπερ ὄρων ἡγμένους ὑμᾶς*.

The absolute use of *δύνασθαι* and still more that of *ἡγμένους* are strange. I conjecture something like <*φαύλως*> *ἡγμένους* (as in *Or.* 13. 15 *ὅταν ὑμεῖς, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, φαύλως ἡγμένοι* κ.τ.λ.) and *τοὺς ἐχθροὺς* <*ἐπιέναι*> *μὴ δυνήσεσθαι*.

33. 2 *καὶ γὰρ ὡς δικαιοτάτοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐστὲ πολλὰ εἰπεῖν καὶ ἑώραν καὶ ὀρῶ, καὶ ὡς ἀρίστων προγόνων, καὶ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα*.

Something like *πόλλ' <ἂν ἔχων> εἰπεῖν*, or *πόλλ' <ἐνόντ'> εἰπεῖν* would seem more likely.

34. 1 *πάλιν ταῦτ' εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν ἐκκλησίαν οὗτοι λαβόντες τούτων κατηγορήσουσιν*.

λαβόντες, which Kennedy translates (with *ταῦτα*) *take the same course*, can hardly be right. I would suggest *ἀναβαλόντες* *having deferred*. To avoid hiatus this should be put before *οὗτοι*, and then we see that the *ανα* may have been lost after the *αν* of *ἐκκλησίαν*.

39. 3 *βουλευθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ παροξυνθέντων τῷ γεγενημένῳ*.

There is nothing in the context to be

supplied with βουλευθέντων. Has not an infinitive been lost?

53. 4 καὶ <τοῦ μὲν> γελάσαι . . μετέδωκαν ὑμῖν?

55. 1 ἐν οὐδέποτε' εὐτυχῆσαι τοῦτο νομίζω.

Should we not write οὐδεπόποτε? In prose οὐδέποτε is usually, if not always, future or present.

Letters. 1. 3 ἔστιν μὲν οὖν ἔργον ἐξ ἐπιτολῆς ἐμμεῖναι συμβουλῇ· πολλοὶς γὰρ εἰώθατ' ἀπαντᾶν ἡμεῖς πρὸ τοῦ περιμεῖναι μαθεῖν.

ἐμμεῖναι συμβουλῇ can hardly be right,

the sense needed here being only *giving advice*. It has arisen, I think, from the περιμεῖναι which follows in the next sentence, and which would have prevented the writer from using ἐμμεῖναι here, even if it were suitable. The true word need not have resembled ἐμμεῖναι, and some other case of συμβουλή may have followed.

2. 7 δι' ὁμιλίας πείσαι προσέχειν αὐτῷ τὸν νοῦν ὡς βούλοιο.

προσέχειν has no distinct subject, and on the other hand ὡς βούλοιο is otiose and weak. Read therefore οὖς for ὡς.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

ON LITERARY ASSOCIATION, AND THE DISREGARD OF IT IN 'LONGINUS.'

THE author of the treatise 'On the Sublime,' whatever was his name and date, is justly reputed one of the best representatives of ancient criticism. All the better does he illustrate a strange and characteristic defect of it, by repeatedly ignoring the possibility, or even the certainty, that a striking word, phrase, or sentence, which is not in keeping with the style of the context, was chosen by the writer for the sake of its literary associations, and owed its effect, the effect of a quotation, to the very fact of its peculiarity.

Let us illustrate this familiar principle by the first example that comes to hand.

'America, gentlemen say, is a noble object. It is an object well worth fighting for. Certainly it is, if fighting a people be the best way of gaining them. Gentlemen in this respect will be led to their choice of means by their complexions and their habits. Those who understand the military art will of course have some predilection for it. Those who *wield the thunder of the state* may have more confidence in the efficacy of arms. But I confess, possibly for want of this knowledge, my opinion is much more in favour of prudent management than of force,' etc.

The pompous phrase here italicized instantly catches the ear, as incongruous with the studied and ironical simplicity of the passage. And therefore in Burke we should suspect, even if we did not know, that it is a quotation, and that the source of it will be worth examining. It comes of course from the famous couplet of Pope,

Argyle, the state's whole thunder born to wield
And shake alike the senate and the field ;

and it depends upon this origin for its meaning. Not military men merely, but military orators, soldiers speaking in Parliament, the opponents of conciliation with America, are 'those who wield the thunder of the state'; Burke is sneering at the violence of their declamations. But it is by Pope, by the context in Pope, and not by the context in Burke, that the innuendo is explained; and in the incongruity of style, as directing the memory to Pope, lies the principal merit of the passage. What would be said of a critic who, ignoring all this, were to tax the incongruity as a fault in the orator?

Yet this is what 'Longinus' does again and again. He ignores the possibility of quotation, not only where there is a presumption in favour of it, but where his own citations, if the idea had occurred to him, are sufficient to prove it. And in some cases, perhaps in all, he is following precedent, an established error of criticism and common to the stock.

'A hazardous business . . . is periphrasis, unless it be handled with discrimination; otherwise it speedily falls flat, with its odour of empty talk and its swelling amplitude. This is the reason why Plato (who is always strong in figurative language, and at times unseasonably so) is taunted, because in his *Laws* he says "that neither gold nor silver treasure should be allowed to establish itself and abide in the city." The critic says that if he had been for-

bidding the possession of sheep or oxen, he would obviously have said "ovine treasure" or "bovine"¹—ἐν τοῖς νόμοις λέγοντα ὡς οὔτε ἀργυροῦν δέῃ πλοῦτον οὔτε χρυσοῦν ἐν πόλει ἰδρυμένον ἔαν οἰκεῖν.

It is assumed that the words criticized are simply Plato's, and that his negligence or want of taste is responsible for the dissonance between them and the proper simplicity of the conversation. Now *first*, such a writer as Plato might claim the contrary presumption; even without evidence we should assume that he is quoting, and meant the quotation to be recognized. *Secondly*, the context confirms this presumption: Plato is warning composers of public prayers to pray only for things beneficial; it has been shown, he says, in the words cited, that gold and silver are not truly beneficial; and he adds that 'not all composers' or 'poets' (ποιηταί) are capable of this distinction, indicating by 'not all' that some of them are, and that the warning against the precious metals, as here shaped, comes itself from a poet. And *finally*, Longinus, whose text of the *Laws* was correct and better than some,² could have proved the presumption; for his citation contains, to a syllable, the words of the iambic couplet to which Plato refers:

ὡς οὔτε Πλοῦτον ἀργυροῦν ἰδρυμένον
ἔαν ἐνοικεῖν οὔτε δέῃ χρυσοῦν πόλει.

What periphrasis is, and what it would be, if misapplied, the example may show; but the criticism of Plato is itself misapplied.³

Similarly fare Xenophon and Timaeus, the historian of Sicily, in the chapter on frugidity, τὸ ψυχρόν.⁴ Xenophon is solemnly rebuked for punning upon κόρη (*maiden, pupil of the eye*) in αἰδημονεστέρεους δ' ἂν αἰτοῦς ἡγήσαιο καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς παρθένων,⁵ 'you would deem them more modest than the very maidens in their eyes'; and Timaeus is charged with stealing the pun from Xenophon, when he wrote ὁ τις ἂν ἐποίησεν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς κόρας, μὴ πόρνas, ἔχων; As if the occurrence of the same quip in two writers, both of whom place it in such a context as to surprise us, and

who yet frame it in words so different that the later is manifestly *not* borrowing from the earlier, were not in itself enough to prove that the thing belonged to neither of them, and was claimed by neither, but was a notorious commonplace, an old favourite of literary speech, introduced by each because of its interesting associations. And in fact each writer points to a prior use. Timaeus cites almost literally from tragedy or tragi-comedy,

ὁ τις ἐποίησεν ἂν,
κόρας ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι, μὴ πόρνas, ἔχων;

Whether on grounds of merit he was entitled to the presumption that he is here quoting, we are not in a position to say, but the censures of 'Longinus' prove nothing to the contrary. Xenophon is so entitled, and also manifestly does quote, but less accurately, and from another passage of tragi-comedy, something like this,

αἰδήμονας δὲ μᾶλλον ἡγήσασαί τις
αὐτοῦς ἂν αὐτῶν τῶν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς κορῶν.

As for the equivocation itself, it was probably as old, and as sacred, as the hills, like the similar one upon κόρος (*pride, son*). Among authors known to us, the most likely to have stamped it for currency are Aeschylus and the oracle of Delphi. We might really as well censure a modern moralist or historian for compromising the dignity of his style, if he used *Tekel* in the sense of 'Thou art found wanting.'

'Yes, and Plato (usually so divine) when he means simply *tablets* says "They shall write and preserve *cypress memorials* in the temples."⁶

But for the other examples, it would be scarcely conceivable that the critic had seen this place with his own eyes, and one would hope that he had not. Plato does *not* 'simply mean tablets,' and there is no more to be said. He is speaking, with great solemnity, of an official prayer, a commination akin to our 'Cursed is he that removeth his neighbour's landmark.' The passage is too long to quote; but let the reader turn to it, and say whether *κυπαριτίνas μνήμαs* is not palpably borrowed from poetry, and designed to enhance the dignity of Plato's own language by the recognized majesty of the place (whatever that was) from which it comes. It is less obvious, but, considering the author, fairly presumable, that Herodotus, when he makes his Persian revellers, who otherwise talk pure

¹ Long. xxix. 1 (Plato, *Laws* 801 B). Transl. of Rhys Roberts, slightly modified in the last clause.

² Baiter-Orelli-Winkelmann give ἐνοικεῖν (for ἔαν οἰκεῖν): ἐνοικεῖν may be right, but the omission of ἔαν is demonstrably wrong.

³ Aristoph. *Plutus* 1191, cited by Prof. Rhys Roberts, alludes doubtless to the same passage of tragedy, and proves it notorious.

⁴ iv.

⁵ *Rep. Lac.* iii. 5.

⁶ iv. 6 (Rhys Roberts), *Laws* 741 c.

prose, describe the Macedonian beauties, seated out of reach on the other side of the table (*ἀντίας ἱζόμενας*), as 'paining their eyes' (*ἀλγυρόνας σφι ὀφθαλμῶν*),¹ is not using mere words of his own, but alluding, not in compliment, to some poem, contrary in sentiment but otherwise similar to the *δοῖς ἐναντίος τοι ἱζάνει*, the *qui sedens adversus identidem te spectat*, of Sappho and Catullus. At all events to censure Herodotus for 'an unseemly exhibition,' without noticing the possibility of such an allusion, is blindness. Since the last speech of the Persian guest at the banquet of Attaginus² is palpable poetry, and in fact is almost entirely made up of poetical quotations slightly transposed, we see that Herodotus did not think it inappropriate (nor is it in his manner of narration) that his barbarians should use Greek literature in this fashion.

'Then we have Plato again (usually so divine) writing *περὶ δὲ τειχῶν*, ὦ Μέγῳλλε, ἐγὼ ξυμφοροῦμένην ἂν τῇ Σπάρτῃ τὸ καθεύδειν εἶν ἐν τῇ γῇ κατακείμενα τὰ τεῖχη καὶ μὴ ἐπανίστασθαι,³ when he means simply that a city should not have walls.'

This 'frigidity' is not to be condoned; it arises, we are told, like other such ugly and parasitical growths, 'from a single cause, that pursuit of novelty in the expression of ideas, which may be regarded as the fashionable craze of the day.'⁴

About 'the day' of Longinus, we may possibly judge when we know what it was. Meanwhile it is certain that in this passage of Plato the departure from the author's ordinary style does *not* arise from 'the pursuit of novelty in expression,' but from the very opposite cause, the modest and natural desire, common to all writers who know their business, to commend new thoughts by old expressions, by clothing them partly in the language of some admired predecessor. Here again one wonders whether the critic can have read Plato. For Plato in the very next words actually mentions 'the excellent and much-quoted speech of the poet on the subject of walls,' and paraphrases a sentence of it: *τῶν δὲ εἵνεκα καλῶς μὲν ὁ ποιητικὸς λόγος ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ὑμνεῖται, τὸ χαλκὰ καὶ σιδηρὰ δεῖν εἶναι τὰ τεῖχη μᾶλλον ἢ γῆνα*, 'bronze and iron,' that is, weapons, 'make better walls than earth.' The mention of 'earth' makes

clear what even without it would naturally be assumed, that the poetical metaphor of the preceding sentence, that walls 'should be let lie and sleep in the earth,' comes from the same source. The play cited does not seem to be known, but was later in date than the celebrated attempt of the Lacedaemonians, after Plataea, to make the Athenians adopt Spartan principles and refrain from rebuilding their fortifications.⁵ The speaker, we notice, refers to the 'restoration' (*ἐπανιστάναι*) not to the mere erection of walls, a fact which alone would show that the language is not Plato's own, for he is concerned only with building. The dramatist apparently found or invented a heroic parallel to that historic situation, and put the argument of 'Sparta' into the mouth of a Spartan. The *disjecta membra* are visible enough,

ἐν γῇ καθεύδειν ταῦτ' ἔατε κείμενα
καὶ μὴ ἐπανίστασθαι(ε) κ.τ.λ.

Of course the fault, which the critic discusses in this chapter, does really exist. There is such a thing, and it is not uncommon, as incongruous language or metaphor adopted without any other motive than the pursuit of novelty, the desire to be strange and striking. Proper examples and safer he might probably have found in his contemporaries. To find them in ancient works was then, and would be now, *ἐπίκτηρον*, 'a hazardous business'; we can hardly be sure that we are not committing the error of Longinus, and ignoring the effect of some literary association. With a contemporary one may respectfully venture: 'I let myself flow out to her in a happy weakness, and looking all about, and before and behind, saw this world like an undesirable desert, where men go as soldiers on a march, following their duty with what constancy they have, and Catriona alone there to offer me some pleasure of my days.' The oddities and contortions here have not, so far as I can see, any literary defence. The style is not that of Stevenson's novel as a whole, and still less appropriate to his hero; it seems to be a mere extravagance of diction, and if it is that, it is an example of *τὸ ψυχρόν*. But the examples in Longinus, all of them so far as they can be tested,⁶ are

⁵ Thucyd. i. 90.

⁶ Of the two that remain, one, the ominous significance of the name *Hermocrates* (iv. 3), cannot possibly have been a legitimate example. Whether Timaeus defended the superstition or derided it (we do not know), in neither case did he commit an offence of style. The comparison of Alexander and Isocrates (iv. 2) may have been a proper illustration, but without seeing the text we cannot say.

¹ Long. *ib.* 7, Herod. v. 18.

² Herod. ix. 16. See *Classical Review*, vol. xvii. p. 98.

³ Long. *ib.* 6, *Laws* 778 D (*ἐπανίστασθαι* Baiter).

⁴ Long. v. 1 (Rhys Roberts).

false, and for the same reason: he ignores the effect, the calculated and legitimate effect, of literary association. His merits and just reputation make the insensibility or inattention to this point, which we cannot but attribute to him and his authori-

ties, all the more significant, as showing what sort of perception we are not to expect from Graeco-Roman critics, and how their judgments need to be discounted.

A. W. VERRALL.

ON SIMPLICIUS DE CAELO, 476, 11 sqq.

HEIBERG's text reads: οἱ δὲ πᾶσας τὰς σφαῖρας τὴν αὐτὴν λέγοντες κίνησιν τὴν ἀπ' ἀνατολῶν κινεῖσθαι καθ' ὑπόληψιν, ὥστε τὴν μὲν Κρονίαν σφαῖραν συναποκαθίστασθαι καθ' ἡμέραν τῇ ἀπλανεῖ παρ' ὀλίγον, τὴν δὲ τοῦ Διὸς παρὰ πλεόν καὶ ἐφεξῆς οὕτως, οὗτοι πολλὰς μὲν ἄλλας ἀπορίας ἐκφεύγουσι.

The phrase καθ' ὑπόληψιν means in conception, in opinion. It is opposed to κατὰ τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων ἀλήθειαν in [Plutarch] Strom. 5, and is out of place here. We must read καθ' ὑπόλειψιν (by) lagging behind. Simplicius is combating a view not explicitly mentioned by Aristotle according to which the planets do not have a proper motion of the 'other' in Plato's phrase from West to East, but all move of their proper motion in the direction of the diurnal revolution from East to West. The apparent easterly revolution of the Moon once a month, the Sun once a year, Saturn once in thirty years,

is due on this theory to their lagging behind (ὑπολείπεσθαι) the diurnal revolution, Saturn slightly, the Sun more, and the Moon most.

Simplicius goes on to argue that, though the theory solves some problems, it is incompatible with the phenomena. If the daily circle of the planetary body is parallel to the equator how does it ever move north and south? If it is oblique (λοξός) why does it not move north and south every day? ἄτε πάντα τὸν λοξὸν κύκλον περιούonta, ὥς φασι, καθ' ἑκάστην τοῦ παντὸς περιφορὰν πλὴν τῶν μοιρῶν, ἃς ὑπολείπομενα φαίνεται. Theon of Smyrna, p. 147 Hiller, uses ὑπολειπτικά and ὑπόλειψιν in the sense required, and I presume that the precise phrase καθ' ὑπόλειψιν might be found by searching the Greek astronomers. In any case it is formed by an obvious analogy and is necessary here.

PAUL SHOREY.

University of Chicago.

ON LUCRETIIUS V. 43 sq.

*At nisi purgatumst pectus, quae proelia nobis
Atque pericula tumst ingratis insinuandum!*

The interpretation generally accepted for these lines is thus given by Munro: 'But unless the breast is cleared, what battles and dangers must then find their way into us in our own despite!' It is hardly possible to prove that this rendering is not correct, but I think that there is good ground for questioning it. In the first place, it seems to overlook the relation between the passage and the verses that immediately precede. In them Lucretius declares that Hercules did not render mankind so great a service by slaying the monsters as Epicurus did with his philosophy, chiefly because the monsters, if they were still in existence,

would have their abodes in remote regions, to which men could generally avoid going. But, he goes on to say, if Epicurus had not given us the means of exorcising the monsters that dwell in the impure heart we should not find it possible to avoid going into perils and conflicts, even against our will. According to this view of the thought the correct translation of the passage would be: 'But unless the breast is cleared, into what battles and dangers must we then find our way in our own despite!' And this interpretation is not, I think, inconsistent with the following verses, which make it clear that the dangers to be encountered come from the passions of one's own breast. It is perfectly natural to say that one goes into a conflict with the

impulses of one's nature, more natural, it seems to me, than to speak of such a conflict entering one from without.

A second reason for doubting the correctness of the usual interpretation is that the construction it requires, accusative and dative with *insinuare*, is not found elsewhere in Lucretius. Indeed, a dative does not occur at all with this verb except in sentences of the ordinary (not gerundive) passive type *aliquid alicui insinuari*, of which there are several examples (i. 113, ii. 684, iii. 689, 722, 729, 738), while an accusative of object affected appears but once, and then in connection with a phrase with *per* (vi. 859 f.). Hence it seems better to regard *nobis* as the apparent agent with the impersonal gerundive, exactly such as we find in iv. 777 f.:

Multaque in his rebus quaeruntur multaque nobis

Clarandumst,

in Cat. 39. 9:

Quare monendum est te mihi,

and in Plaut. Trin. 869

mi agitandumst vigilias.

In the same way it is better to look upon *proelia* and *pericula* as the accusative, not of the object affected, but of the limit of the action. There are four clear cases of such an accusative with this verb in Lucretius; thus in i. 408 f. we find:

poteris caecaeque latebras

Insinuare omnis;

and in v. 73 f.:

Et quibus ille modis divum metus insinuarit

Pectora.

The other two cases are more striking, because in them this accusative seems a much less natural construction than the dative would be. In i. 116 it is used in

connection with the accusative of the reflexive:

An pecudes alias divinitus insinuet se;

and in iv. 1030 it is made to depend upon a passive verb:

Tum quibus aetatis freta primitus insinuat

Semen.

These examples make it clear that the proposed interpretation involves only constructions that may be found elsewhere in Lucretius; the traditional view, as has been said, requires a combination of constructions without parallel in his work. Yet we must admit that there would be nothing unreasonable in supposing that Lucretius has here indulged in a unique construction with *insinuare*. He has done so in no less than five other places, and he actually has eleven different constructions with the word in a total of twenty-eight¹ occurrences (excluding the present passage). Still, the terminal accusative is one of his favourites, and I am disposed, in view of the improvement that it makes in the sense, to hold that he used it here.

CHARLES N. COLE.

OBERLIN COLLEGE,
OBERLIN, OHIO.

¹ The following list of occurrences and constructions of this verb in Lucretius is, I think, complete, and it may be of interest in connection with this passage:—

I. Active Voice.

- (a) Absolute, iii. 485, iv. 331.
- (b) With *per*, vi. 89, 385, 778.
- (c) With acc. object affected and *per*, vi. 860.
- (d) With reflexive, ii. 436.
- (e) With terminal acc., i. 409, v. 73.
- (f) With reflexive and terminal acc., i. 116.

II. Passive Voice.

- (a) Nothing dependent, iii. 698, 780, 782, vi. 277, 355, 955.
- (b) With dative, i. 113, ii. 684, iii. 689, 722, 729, 738.
- (c) With *in*, iii. 671, iv. 525, vi. 234, 802.
- (d) With *per* and *ad*, vi. 1031.
- (e) With terminal acc., iv. 1030.

CAESAR DE BELLO GALLICO V. 12.

CLASSICAL scholars in England have always been separated by a strange and regrettable gulf from the English archaeological societies and their work. It is therefore possible that readers of the

Classical Review may have overlooked an interesting contribution to the interpretation of Caesar, recently laid by Mr. Reginald A. Smith before the Society of Antiquaries (26 Jan.).

Caesar remarks of the British coinage of his time that the Britons *utuntur aut aere aut nummo aureo aut taleis ferreis ad certum pondus examinatis*. It is usually agreed that *aut aere* is interpolated and that *nummo aureo* refers to the well known coinage in gold. But the 'iron bars' are an old puzzle. Mr. Smith now proposes to identify them with certain iron objects found, sometimes with Celtic remains, in the south and west of England. These iron objects somewhat resemble unfinished swordblades. They are flat and slightly tapering blades with blunt vertical edges and rude handles made by turning up the edges to meet one another at one end. They have been discovered at some eleven sites, such as Maidenhead, Ventnor, Hod Hill in Dorset, Ham Hill and Glastonbury in Somerset, Bourton in Gloucestershire and Malvern, in very varying quantities. Glastonbury has yielded 2, Hod Hill 17, Ham Hill 70, Bourton 147, Malvern 300. Their date seems assured by their occurrence in the Pre-Roman village at Glastonbury and by their occasional association elsewhere with Late Celtic remains. They have usually been taken to be unfinished swords, but once or twice the guess has been emitted that they are Caesar's *taleae ferreae*. Mr. Smith has lately examined these objects and adduced good reasons for accepting the guess. The 'swords' appear on careful scrutiny to contain more iron and to be longer and thicker than would be natural in half-manufactured Celtic swords. On the other hand, their weights, taken in round figures, seem to suggest a definite

standard. The average weight of the majority of specimens seems to approximate to 580 or 600 grammes: on the other hand certain smaller specimens weigh 305 grammes or thereabouts, certain larger ones weigh 1161 and 1218 grammes, and a bronze 'weight' found lately with Celtic objects in Glamorgan weighs 309 grammes. This implies a unit of about 600 grammes, a half-unit of about 300, and a double unit of about 1200. Other specimens deviate somewhat from these norms. But great precision is hardly likely in an iron currency, while, thanks to rust and weathering, the original weights of the various bars can now be only ascertained very roughly. Mr. Smith's theory appears, therefore, to have established a *prima-facie* case to be carefully considered. His paper will be published in the second part of vol. xx of Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries.

I may add that the reading *anulis* (iron rings) for *taleis*, which Meusel quotes as a Renaissance conjecture of the *editio princeps*, Beroaldus and the like, is really older. It occurs in an eleventh century MS. — early rather than late in the century, as Mr. Kenyon tells me—in the British Museum (Addit. 10084), which might deserve a further glance. The reading appears to be a mere emendation on the unintelligible *aut aliis* which early superseded in many MSS. the proper *aut taleis* and it might date from a period very far anterior to the eleventh century.

F. HAVERFIELD.

REPRAESENTATIO TEMPORUM IN THE ORATIO OBLIQUA OF CAESAR.

PREFATORY NOTE.

THE following article is based upon a section of an essay for which Mr. A. P. SAVUNDRANĀYAGAM was awarded the prize for philological research at University College, London. With a view to its ultimate publication it was referred back to the author for revision, but at the time when it reached Mr. Savundranāyagam, he was on the point of leaving England for Ceylon, where he still resides. This limited the author's opportunities of revision and made it necessary for others to complete the work of preparing the MS. for publication. It has accordingly been deemed advisable to

NO. CLXVIII. VOL. XIX.

separate the collection of materials (Part I.), which, with the exception of the passages printed between square brackets, was made entirely by Mr. Savundranāyagam, from the observations upon them which will follow in Part II.

PART I.—MATERIALS.

The passages cited below are a collection from the *Bellum Gallicum*, Books I.—VII. and the *Bellum Civile*.

For the *Bellum Gallicum* Peskett's, Kübler's, and Meusel's editions were consulted, together with the recently published Oxford Text. For the *Bellum Civile* Kübler's and Peskett's (I., III.).

P

A *V* following a quotation means that in it there is some variation in the MSS. from the text printed, account of which will be taken in Part II.

Of the abbreviations used *P* means that the tenses in the passages cited are those of Primary Sequence, *S* those of Secondary Sequence, *M* of Primary and Secondary Sequence mixed. *H.P.* stands for *Historic Present*.

The references to noteworthy passages are printed in italics.

The words in the Latin extracts printed in spaced roman type are the ones which would presumably have been used in the *Oratio Recta*.

BOOK I.

7. § 3 (*M*) *Mittunt* nobilissimos ciuitatis—qui *dicerent* sibi esse in animo sine ullo maleficio iter per provinciam facere, propterea quod aliud iter *haberent* (*habemus*) nullum; rogare ut eius uoluntate id sibi facere *liceat* (*liceat*).

§ 6 (*S*) *respondit* [Caesar] diem se ad deliberandum sumpturum; si quid *uellent*, a.d. Id. Apr. *reuerterentur*.

8. § 3 (*P*) Primary tenses after *H.P.* *negat*—*ostendit*.

11. § 3 (*P*) After *H.P.* 'legatos *mittunt* rogatum auxilium; ita se omni tempore de P. R. meritos esse, ut paene in conspectu exercitus nostri agri uastari, liberi eorum in seruitutem abduci, oppida expugnari non *deberint*.'

13. § 3-7 (*S*) After 'ita cum Caesare *egit*.'

14. §§ 1-6 (*M*) After Caesar *respondit* first *S*. Then 'consuesse enim deos immortales quo grauius homines ex commutatione rerum *doleant*, quos pro scelere eorum ulcisci *uelint*, his secundoiores interdum res et diuturniorem impunitatem concedere. Cum ea ita *sint*, tamen, si obsides ab iis sibi *dentur* (*dabuntur* or *dentur*) uti ea quae *polliceantur* (*pollicemini*) facturos *intellegat* (*intellegam*), et si Aeduis de iniuriis, quas ipsis sociisque eorum *intulerint* (*intulistis*), item si Allobrogibus *satisfaciant* (*satisfacietis* or *satisfaciatis*), sese cum iis pacem esse facturum.'

14. § 7 Divitiaco *respondit*: ita Helvetios a maioribus suis institutos esse, uti obsides accipere, non dare *consuerint*.

17. §§ 1-6 (*P*) After *H.P.* *proponit* (*V*).

18. §§ 3-10 (*P*) After *H.P.* implied in *quaerit*.

20. §§ 2-4 (*S*) After *obsecrare coepit*.

30. §§ 2-4 (*S*) After *gratulatum conuenerunt*.

[31. § 2 (*S*) After verb implied in *fientes se proiecerunt*.]

31. §§ 3-16 (*M*) *Locutus est* Diuitiacus: Hi cum tanto opere—*contenderent* (*contendant*), factum esse, uti *arcesse-ventur*—posteaquam—*adamassent* (*adamarunt*), traductos plures—qui—*potuissent* (*potuerant*)—sese neque obsides repetituros neque recusaturos quominus—*essent* (*simus*)—unum se esse—qui adduci non *potuerit* (*potui*) ut *iuraret* (*iurarem*) aut liberos suos obsides *daret* (*darem*)—then Secondary Tenses to § 12. Ariouistum autem ut semel Gallorum copias proelio *uicerit* (*uicit*), quod proelium *factum sit* (*factum est*) Admagetobrigae, superbe et crudeliter imperare obsides nobilissimi cuiusque liberos poscere et in eos omnia exempla cruciatusque edere si qua... *facta sit* (*facta est* or *sit*), etc. Then Primary Tenses, to end of chapter (*V*).

32. §§ 4, 5 (*S*) After *respondit*.

34. §§ 2-4 (*M*) After *respondit*. 'Si quid ipsi a Caesare opus *esset*, sese ad eum *uenturum fuisse*; si quid ille se *uelit*, illum ad se venire oportere.' Then follow Secondary Tenses to end of chapter (*V*).

35. §§ 2-4 (*S*) After 'cum his *mandatis mittit*.'

36. §§ 1-7 (*S*) After *respondit*.

[37. §§ 2, 3 (*S*) After *ueniebant questum*.]

[39. § 6 (*S*) After *dicebant*.]

40. §§ 1-15 (*M*) uehementer eos *incusauit*, Secondary tenses to § 5. Then 'factum eius hostis periculum patrum nostrorum memoria, cum Cimbris et Teutonis a Gaio Mario pulsus non minorem laudem exercitus quam ipse imperator meritis *uidebatur* (*uidebatur*).'¹ Then Secondary Tenses to § 7. Then 'denique hos esse eosdem quibuscum saepenumero H. congressi—plerumque *superarint* (*superauerunt*), qui tamen pares esse nostro exercitui non *potuerint*' (*potuerunt*). Then follow Secondary Tenses to § 12 'quod non fore dicto audientes neque signa latari *dicantur* (*dicuntur*), nihil se ea re

¹ Here the sudden transition into *Oratio Recta* is noticeable.

commoveri: scire enim quibuscumque exercitus dicto audiens non *fuorit* (fuit), aut male re gesta fortunam defuisse aut etc. Then follow Secondary Tenses till we come to § 15 'Quod si praeterea nemo *sequatur* (*sequetur* or *sequatur*), tamen secum sola decima legione iturum de qua non *dubitaret*...' (V § 7).

42. § 4 (S) After *postulavit*.

[§ 6 (S) After *dixit*.]

43. §§ 4-9 (M) After *docebat* in § 6 'P. R. hanc esse consuetudinem, ut socios atque amicos—gratia, dignitate, honore auctiores *velit* (uelit) esse; quod uero ad amicitiam P. R. *attulissent* (attulerunt), id iis eripi quis *posset* (possit)'. The preceding §§ 4-7 after *commemoravit—docebat* and following (after *postulavit* § 9) parts have the regular Secondary Sequence (V § 4).

44. §§ 2-13 (M) Ariouistus multa *praedicavit*.—stipendium capere iure belli, quod uictores uictis imponere *consuerint* (consuerunt).—§ 4 Si iterum experiri *uelint* (uolunt), se iterum paratum esse decertare. Primary Sequence continues till (in § 8) it passes into Secondary Sequence with 'Quid sibi *uellet*.' From here Secondary Sequence continues till § 10 where it passes into Primary Sequence in 'Debere se suspicari simulata Caesarem amicitia, quod exercitum in Gallia *habeat* (habet or habeas) sui opprimendi causa habere. Qui nisi *decedat* atque—*deducat* sese—habiturum. Quod si eum *interfecerit* multis sese—gratum esse facturum.' Then follow Secondary Tenses to the end of the chapter (V § 4).

45. §§ 1-3 (S) After *multa dicta sunt*.

BOOK II.¹

[3. §§ 2-5 (P) After *miserunt* qui *dicerent* reliquos—Belgas in armis esse—Germanosque qui cis Rhenum *incolant* sese cum his coniunxisse tantumque esse eorum omnium furorem ut ne Suesiones quidem, qui eodem iure—*utantur*, unum imperium—cum ipsis *habeant*, detertere *potuerint* quia cum his *consentirent*.]

[4. §§ 1-3 (M) Cum ab his quaereret quae ciuitates quantaque in armis essent et quid in bello possent sic *reperiebat* [Belgas] Gallos qui ea loca *incolerent* (incolebant) expulisse solosque esse qui patrum nostrorum memoria—Teutonos Cim-

brosque—*prohibuerint*; qua ex re fieri ut—magnos spiritus in re militari *sumerent* (*sumant*) (V § 2).]

[§§ 4-10 (P) After *dicebant*. 'De numero omnia se habere explorata Remi dicebant propterea quod—quantam quisque multitudinem—*pollicitus sit cognouerint*—apud eos fuisse regem nostra etiam memoria Diuitiacum qui—etiam Britanniae imperium *obtinerit*: nunc esse regem Galbam—totidem Nervios qui maxime feri—*habeantur* longissimeque *absint*—Paemanos qui uno nomine Germani *appellantur* arbitrari ad XL milia' (V § 4).]

14. §§ 2-6 (P) After *H.P.* 'Pro his Diuitiacus—*facit uerba*:—qui huius consilii principes *fuissent*, quod *intellegerent* quantam calamitatem ciuitati *intulissent*, in Britanniam profugisse. Petere non solum Bello-uacos sed etiam pro his Aeduos, ut sua clementia ac mansuetudine in eos *utatur*. Quod si *fecerit* (feceris fut. perf.), Aeduum auctoritatem apud omnes Belgas amplificaturum, quorum auxiliis atque opibus, si qua bella *inciderint*, sustentare *consuerint*.'

15. §§ 3-5 (S) After 'sic *reperiebat*.'

[16. §§ 2-4 After *inueniebat*.]

31. §§ 2-6 (S) After *dixerunt* § 3.

32. §§ 1-3 (S) After *respondit*.

BOOK III.

[8. § 3 'celeriter missis legatis per suos principes inter se coniurant nihil nisi communi consilio acturos—reliquasque ciuitates *solicitant* ut in ea libertate quam a maioribus *acceperunt* permanere—*mallent*' (*malitis*) V.]

8. § 5 (P) After *H.P.* 'legationem ad P. Crassum *mittunt*: si *uelit* suos recipere obsides sibi *remittat*.'

18. § 4 (P) After *H.P. docet*.

BOOK IV.

7. §§ 3-5 (P) After 'haec *fuit oratio*.'

8. §§ 1-3 (M) exitus *fuit orationis*: sibi nullam cum his amicitiam esse posse, si in Gallia *remanerent* (remanebitis); neque uerum esse, qui suos fines tueri non *potuerint*, alienos occupare; neque ullos—uacare agros qui dari—*possint*; sed licere si *uelint* in Ubiorum finibus consistere quorum *sint* legati apud se et—*querantur* et—auxilium *petant*.

[11. § 3 (S) After *ostendebant*.]

¹ From this point the form of the verb in Oratio Recta is usually added only when the tense is different.

[11. § 5 (S) After '*mittit qui nuntiarent.*']

[16. § 4 (S) After *responderunt.*]

§§ 5-7 (M) After '*magnopere orabant.*' Secondary Tenses follow regularly, until the point of the speech is reached in the following words: '*Tantum esse nomen atque opinionem eius exercitus Ariouisto pulso et hoc nouissimo proelio facto etiam ad ultimas Germanorum nationes, uti opinione et amicitia populi Romani tuti esse possint.*'

BOOK V.

3. §§ 6, 7 (S) After *H.P.* '*legatos ad Caesarem mittit.*'

27. §§ 2-11 (M) '*Ad hunc modum Ambiorix locutus est.*' There follow Secondary Tenses until they pass into Primary in § 3 '*neque id, quod fecerit de oppugnatione castrorum, aut iudicio aut uoluntate sua fecisse, sed coactu ciuitatis, suaeque esse eiusmodi imperia ut non minus haberet* (Secondary again for *habeat*) *iuris in se multitudo quam ipse in multitudinem. ciuitati porro hanc fuisse belli causam, quod repentinae Gallorum coniurationi resistere non potuerit. id se facile ex humilitate sua probare posse, quod non adeo sit imperitus rerum, ut suis copiis populum Romanum superari posse confidat. sed esse Galliae commune consilium: omnibus hibernis Caesaris oppugnandis hunc esse dictum diem ne qua legio alteri legioni subsidio uenire posset* (*posset*) *non facile Gallos Gallis negare potuisse praesertim cum—consilium initum uideretur* (*uideretur*) and the speech ends in Primary Sequence.

28. § 4 (P) After *docebant:* '*rem esse testimonio, quod primum hostium impetum, multis uulneribus illatis, fortissime sustinuerint.*'

29. §§ 1-7 (S) After *clamitabat* (V § 5).

31. §§ 1, 2 (P) After *H.P.* *orant.*

34. § 1 (S) After *iusserunt.*

36. § 2 (P) After *respondit.*

[§ 3 (P) After *H.P.* *communicat.*]

38. §§ 2-4 (P) After *H.P.* *hortatur.*

41. §§ 5, 6 (P) After *H.P.* *dicunt.*

§§ 7, 8 (P) After *respondit.*

[46. § 4 '*Scribit* Labieno si reipublicae commodo facere posset (*possit*) cum legione ad fines Neruiorum ueniat' (V § 4).]

51. § 3 (P) After *H.P.* '*pronuntiari iubent.*'

BOOK VI.

7. § 6 (P) After *H.P.* *loquitur.*

8. § 1 (M) '*Galli cohortati inter se ne speratam praedam ex manibus dimitterent; longum esse, perterritis Romanis, Germanorum auxilium expectare; neque suam pati dignitatem ut tantis copiis tam exiguum manum, praesertim fugientem atque impeditam, adoriri non audeant, flumen transire—non dubitant.*'

9. § 7 (M) After *H.P.* '*orant* ut sibi parcat ne—innocentes—poenam pendant. si amplius obsidum uellet dare, pollicentur' (V).

10. § 4 (P) After *H.P.* *referunt.*

23. § 7 (P) After *dixit.* '*Atque ubi quis ex principibus in concilio dixit, se ducem fore, qui sequi uelint profiteantur.*'

BOOK VII.

1. §§ 6-8 (P) After *H.P.* *dicunt.*

2. § 1 (P) After *H.P.* *petunt.*

[5. § 2 (P) After *H.P.* '*legatos mittunt*' (V).

§ 5 (P) After *H.P.* '*renuntiant* se Biturigum perfidiam ueritos reuertisse quibus id consilii fuisse cognouerint ut si flumen transissent una ex parte ipsi, altera Aruerni se circumsisterent.'

[9. § 2 (P) After *H.P.* *monet.*]

14. §§ 2-10 (P) After *H.P.* *docet.*

15. § 4 (M) After *H.P.* *Procumbunt* omnibus Gallis ad pedes Bituriges, ne pulcherrimam prope totius Galliae urbem, quae praesidio et ornamento sit ciuitati, suis manibus succendere cogerentur. Then § 5 (P) after *H.P.* *dicunt.*

17. §§ 4-7 (S) After *petebant.*

20. §§ 3-7 (M) After (S) '*ad haec respondit:*' following several Secondary Tenses, we have § 4 '*et illic fuisse utilem, quo sint profecti.*' Then Secondary Tenses again till § 6 when we have '*interuenerint*' and '*dimicare potuerint*' and '*receperint.*' Then Secondary Tenses are resumed until Vercingetorix reaches the climax when he says, '*quin etiam ipsis remittere, si sibi magis honorem tribuere quam ab se salutem accipere uideantur*' (V § 7).

29. §§ 1-7' (M) After (S) '*cohortatus est* ne se—animo demitterent, ne perturbarentur,' then § 2 '*cuius rei fuerint ipsi imperiti.*' Then Primary Tenses in a general maxim. Then Secondary Tenses (§ 4) until a

climax is reached in the words (§ 6) 'atque unum consilium totius Galliae effecturum, cuius consensui ne orbis terrarum quidem possit obsistere.' Then Secondary Tenses again.

32. §§ 2-5 (M) Primary Tenses after *H. P.* in § 3 'ueniunt oratum' except 'consuescent.'

37. §§ 2-5 (P) After *H. P. hortatur.*

38. § 5 (S) After *H. P. exponunt,*

39. § 3 (M) After *H. P.* 'Quod futurum provideat, si se tot hominum milia cum hostibus coniunxerint, quorum salutem neque propinqui negligere neque ciuitas levi momento aestimare posset' (! 'possit').

40. § 4 (P) 'Adhortatus milites ne—pernoueantur—iter eorum—impedit interdicitque omnibus ne quemquam interficiant.'

41. §§ 2-4 (P) After *H. P. exponunt.* Then 'summis copiis castra oppugnata demonstrant cum—succederent nostrosque defetigarent quibus—perpetuo esset isdem in uallo permanendum.'

52. §§ 1-4 (S) After *reprehendit* (§ 1), *exposuit* (§ 2).

53. § 1 (S) After 'confirmatis militibus ne...'

54. § 4 (S) After *exposuit.*

60. § 1 (S) After *cohortatus ut.*

62. § 2 (S) After *cohortatus ut.*

64. §§ 2-3 (P) After *H. P. dicit.*

66. §§ 3-6 (P) After *H. P. demonstrat* (V § 4).

§ 7 After *H. P.* 'Conclamant equites, sanctissimo iure iurando confirmari oportere ne tecto recipiatur, ne ad liberos—aditum habeat qui non bis per agmen hostium perequitasset' (V).

[90. § 2 *H. P.* 'legati ab Aruernis missi quae imperaret se facturos pollicentur.']

DE BELLO CIVILI.

BOOK I.

1. §§ 2, 3 (P) After *H. P. pollicetur.*

1. § 4 (P) After *H. P. loquitur.*

[2. §§ 2-3 (S) After 'dixerat aliquis leniorem sententiam.'

§ 6 (P) After 'Scipionis sententiam sequuntur.'

5. § 3 (P) 'Decurritur ad illud ex-

tremum atque ultimum S.C.—*dent operam consules,*' etc.

[6. §§ 1 *sqq.* (P) After *agit.*]

7. §§ 1-7 (P) After *H. P. contionatur.*

In this speech of Caesar's to the XIIIth legion he keeps the Primary Sequence, except in 'Nouum in rempublicam introductum exemplum queritur, ut tribunicia intercessio armis notaretur atque opprimeretur' (§ 2), and also in 'Quotienscumque sit decretum, darent operam magistratus ne quid respublica detrimenti caperet, qua voce et quo senatus consulto P. R. ad arma sit uocatus, factum in perniciosis legibus e.q.s.' § 5.

8. § 2 (P) After 'habere se a Pompeio—mandata demonstrat.'

9. §§ 1-6 (P) After *H. P. petit.*

10. §§ 3-4 (S) After 'mandata remittunt quorum haec erat summa.'

[11. §§ 1-2 (M) 'Erat iniqua condicio postulare ut Caesar—excederet atque—reuerteretur—neque ante quem diem iturus sit definire.']

13. § 1 (P) After *H. P.* 'docent sui iudicii rem non esse—proinde habeat rationem posteritatis.'

17. §§ 1, 2 (P) After *H. P.* 'mittit qui orient.'

18. § 1 (S) After *H. P. nuntiatur.*

19. § 1 (P) After *H. P. hortatur.*

§ 4 (S) After *rescripserat.*

[20. § 2 (P) After *H. P. conloquuntur.*]

§ 5 (P) After *H. P. mittunt.*

22. § 1 (P) After *H. P. conloquitur.*

§ 5 After *H. P. interpellat.*

§ 6 (P) After *H. P. petit.*

24. § 5 (P) After *H. P.* 'remittit cum mandatis.'

26. §§ 3, 4 'mittit et eum conloqui causa:—in primis ut ipse cum Pompeio conloqueretur postulat: magnopere sese confidere demonstrat si eius rei sit potestas facta, etc. with Primary Tenses.

§ 5 (P) After *H. P. renuntiat.*

30. § 5 After *H. P.* 'queritur in contione sese proiectum ac proditum a Cn. Pompeio qui omnibus rebus imparatissimis—bellum suscepisset et ab se reliquisque in senatu interrogatus omnia sibi esse ad bellum—parata confirmauisset.'

32. §§ 2-9 (M but chiefly P) After *H. P.* 'docet se—expectato legitimo tempore consulatus eo fuisse contentum quod omnibus ciuibz pateret latum—ut sui ratio

absentis haberetur; ipso consule Pompeio: qui si improbasset, cur ferri passus esset? si probasset, cur se uti populo beneficio prohibuisset? patientiam proponit suam cum de exercitibus dimittendis ultro postulauisset in quo iacturam—ipse facturum esset. acerbiter inimicorum docet qui quod ab altero postularent in se recusarent atque omnia permisceri mallent quam etc.—

(§ 6) 'pro quibus rebus orat ac postulat ut rempublicam suscipiant atque administrant. sin timore defugiant illi se oneri non defuturum—neque se reformidare quod—Pompeius paulo ante dixisset ad quos legati mitterentur his auctoritatem attribui timoremque eorum qui mitterent significari—se—ut operibus anteire studuerit, sic iustitia.'

[33. § 2 (S) After *dixerat*.]

35. §§ 3-5 (P) After *H.P. renuntiavit*.

64. § 2 (S) After HISTORIC INFINITIVE.

67. §§ 1-5 (M) After '*censebant ut noctu iter facerent posse prius ad angustias ueniri quam sentiretur*. alii quod—*conclamatum esset in Caesaris castris*, argumenti sumebant loco non posse clam exiri—nocturnaue proelia esse uitanda quod perterritus miles—timori magis—consulere consueverit.' Then Primary Tenses.

69. § 2 (S) After '*laudibus ferebant*.'

71. §§ 2-4 (S) After '*concurrerant legati*.'

72. §§ 1, 2 (S) After '*in eam spem uenerat*.'

74. § 2 After *H.P.* '*agunt gratias quod sibi perterritis pridie pepercissent: eorum se beneficio uiuere. dein de imperatoris fide quaerunt rectene se illi sint commissuri. et quod non ab initio fecerint—armaque—contulerint queruntur*.'

§ 3 (P) After *H.P. petunt*.

76. § 4 (P) After *H.P. edicunt*.

84. §§ 3-5 (P) After *H.P. loquitur*.

85. §§ 1-12 After *respondit* (P till § 12, then M) '*proinde ut esset dictum prouinciis excederent exercitusque dimitterent: si id sit factum, se nociturum nemini*.'

86. § 2 (S) After '*significare coeperunt*.'

87. § 1 (P) After *H.P.* '*pollicetur—addit*.'

BOOK II.

12. §§ 3, 4 (M) After *H.P.* '*orant ut aduentus Caesaris expectetur—nullam ex-*

oriri moram posse quominus cum uenisset (uenerit), si imperata non facerent (facient or facient), e uestigio diriperentur (diripiantur). docent si omnino turris concidisset (conciderit), non posse milites contineri quin spe praedae in urbem intrumperent (intrumpant) urbemque delerent (delegant).'

[13. § 3 (S) After '*mandauerat ne...*']

17. § 2 (S) After *loquebatur*.

20. §§ 2, 3 After *H.P.* '*litterae red-duntur*' the Secondary Tenses of the original are retained.

[21. § 1 'Caesar contione habita Cordubae omnibus generatim gratias agit ciuibus Romanis quod oppidum in sua potestate studuissent habere, Hispanis quod praesidia expulissent, Graditanis quod conatus aduersariorum infregissent seseque in libertatem vindicauissent, tribunis militum centurionibusque (qui eo praesidii causa uenerant) quod eorum consilia sua uirtute confirmauissent.']

25. § 6 (S) After *H.P.* '*Curio pronuntiarum onerariis nauibus iubet* (quae stabant ad Uticam numero circiter CC) se in hostium habiturum loco qui non ex uestigio ad castra Cornelia naues traduxisset.'

28. §§ 2, 3 (S) After '*obsecrare coepit*' and '*addidit*.'

30. §§ 2, 3 (S) After '*erant sententiae—dicebant—erant qui censerent*.'

[31. § 1 (S) After *dicebat*. The bulk of the speech is reported in O. Recta.]

32. § 1 (P) After *H.P. commemorat*. The bulk of the speech is reported in O. Recta.

[34. § 5 (S) ille unum elocutus ut memoria tenerent milites ea quae pridie sibi confirmassent sequi se iubet.]

BOOK III.

6. § 1 (S) After *contionatus* and in the reply after *conclamantibus*.

10. §§ 3-11 (S) After '*erat haec summa mandatorum*' (V § 4).

12. § 2 (S) After HISTORIC INFINITIVE.

[13. § 3 (S) After *H.P.* '*cum prope Dyrachium Pompeius constitisset castra quae metari iussisset—Labienus procedit iuratque se—eundem casum subitum quemcunque ei Fortuna tribuisset*.'

15. § 6 (P) After *H.P. loquuntur*.

16. §§ 3-5 (M) After *H.P.* '*excusat Bibulum*.' In § 4 '*potestatem eius rei*

nullam habere quod—summam belli—Pompeio *permiserint*—interea *manerent* indutiae dum ab illo rediri *posset*, neue alter alteri *noceret*.'

17. §§ 2-4 (S) After *postulabat*.

19. § 3 (S) After '*mittit* qui *pronuntiaret*.'

[§ 4 (S) After *responsum est*.]

31. § 4 (S) After '*uoces cum audirentur*.'

33. § 1 (S) After *H.P.* '*litterae ei reduntur*' a Pompeio—*properaret*—omniaque post *haberet*.'

36. § 6 (S) After '*litterae sunt consecutae*.'

45. § 6 (S) After '*dicitur—dixisse*.'

57. §§ 2-4 (S) After '*dat* litteras mandataque quorum haec *erat* summa.'

73. §§ 2-6 (S) After *hortatus est*.

[82. § 4 (S) After '*magna fuit controuersia*.']

90. §§ 1, 2 (S) After *commemorauit*.

[102. § 6 (S) After '*cognouit* nuntios *dimissos*.']

105. § 1 After *reperiebant*.

TIBULLIANA.

I. vi. 1-4:

Semper, ut inducar, blandos offers mihi
uultus,
post tamen es misero tristis et asper,
Amor.
quid tibi *seuitie* mecum est? an gloria
magna est
insidias homini composuisse deum?

We have not to travel far from the tradition of the Ambrosianus, the best of the bad manuscripts of Tibullus, in order to obtain a satisfactory correction of line 3. For *i* has been miscopied for *e* at I. ii. 81 '*magni*' for '*magne*' i.e. '*magnae*' and *t* for *r* at II. i. 45 '*antea*' A for '*aurea*' which the Paris excerpts have preserved. We should therefore restore:

quid tibi, *saeue*, *rei* mecum est?

For the exact phrase compare Terence *Adelphi* 177 '*quid tibi rei mecum est?*' The scansion of *rei* is Augustan (e.g. Hor. *carm.* 3. 16. 25). '*Saeue puer*' has already been conjectured by the Itali.

ib. 15 *sqq.*:

at tu, fallacis coniunx incaute puellae,
me quoque seruato peccet ut illa nihil
neu iuuenes celebret multo sermone caueto
neue cubet laxo pectus aperta sinu
neu etc.

The editors place a full stop after *nihil*. But what '*me quoque*' then means, it is very hard to see: *seruato* is however not the imperative but the ablative of the

participle; and if any stop is added it should be a comma. The '*quoque*' then refers to the other '*iuuenes*' of the next line. The ambiguous form in *-ato* has caused trouble elsewhere: see Prop. i. 21. 5, iii. 17. 29.

I. ix. 23 *sqq.*:

nec tibi celandi spes sit peccare paranti:
scit deus, occultos qui uetat esse dolos
ipse deus tacito permisit *leue* ministro
ederet ut multo libera uerba mero:
ipse deus somno domitos emittere uocem
iussit et inuitos facta tegenda loqui.

On 25 *sq.*, one of the most desperate passages in Tibullus, it is perhaps worth observing that *leue* seems to be for *len(a)e* which is a gloss on *ministro*, a right but somewhat superfluous explanation. For the sense of the couplet we may compare Plautus *Cistellaria* 125 *sqq.* where the *lena* says:

quia ego nunc quasi sum onusta mea ex
sententia,
quiaque adeo me compleui flore Liberi,
magis libera uti lingua conlubitum est
mihi:
tacere nequeo misera quod tacito usus est.

These lines are not in the Ambrosianus and were bracketed by Windischmann as un-Plautine and a duplicate of 120-122 which express the same idea; but as an illustration they will serve. It seems possible that the lost word is *uina*, the sense being that Providence allowed the

generally reticent slave to have access to the wine-cellar, and the secret was out.

(In 24 I have printed *scit*, a Renaissance emendation, for the *sit* of A and the *est* of Par.)

Panegyricus Messallae 140 sqq. :

pro qua uel Nilus uel regia lympha
Choaspes,
profluit aut rapidus Cyri dementia Gyndes,
ardet arectais aut unda perhospita campis.
(So F, A Creteis ardet aut unda caristia
campis).

The main difficulty in this passage is to adjust the claims to credit of the readings of the Ambrosianus and of the much better F or Fragmentum Cuiacianum. The origin of the first of the divergences in 142 is clear. The reading of A is practically the same as that of F; but the letters and the words have been shifted. The shift of words was easy enough with the homolographon *ardet arect*, the transposition in A being a secondary effect of the omission (see *C.R.* xvi. pp. 308 sq.); and not less easy if Lachmann's emendation *aret* is right, as it seems to be. The *arectais* of F means *Aracc(a)eis*, *Ἀρακκα* being the name of the town in Ptolemy, *Geogr.* 6. 3.

We now come to the end of the line. Here Heinsius, apparently building upon F, conjectured *haut una per ostia*, no stop being placed after *Gyndes* (AF *Cydnus*), and Lachmann put the conjecture into his text. It is however quite untenable. For the author is alluding to the well known story of the insensate rage of Cyrus against the river Gyndes narrated by Herodotus in i. 189; and this river, that historian states in the clearest terms, did not fall into the sea as *ostia* would imply, but into the *Tigris*. ἐπὶ Γύνδῃ ποταμῷ τοῦ αἰ μὲν πηγὰς ἐν Ματινοῖσι οὖρεσι, ῥέει δὲ διὰ Δαρδανέων, ἐκδιδόει δὲ ἐς ἕτερον ποταμὸν Τίγριν, ὃ δὲ παρὰ Ὀπιν πόλιν ῥέων ἐς τὴν Ἐρυθρὴν θάλασσαν ἐκδιδόει. Nor again is the disemboгуing of the river anything to the point, as Cyrus' threat was that by the dispersion of the water through his channels he would make its stream so feeble that for the future καὶ γυναῖκάς μιν, εὐπετέως τὸ γόνυ οὐ βρεχούσας, διαβήσονται. There is accordingly no reason why we should regard F's *perhospita* which, like one or two more of its reported readings, has the air of being an attempt to make sense,

as entitled to especial consideration. I suggest that F's and A's readings came as *PHOSPITA* and *CARISTIA* respectively, from attempts to make something out of *OROATIA*. The *Oroatis* is a river of Susiana, geographically and otherwise suitable, as may be seen from the following quotations.

Strabo iv. c. 3 § 1: τριττὴ δ' ἐστὶ καὶ τῇ φύσει καὶ τῇ τῶν ἀέρων κράσει. ἡ μὲν γὰρ παραλία καναματηρά τε καὶ ἀμυώδης καὶ σπανιστὴ καρποῖς ἐστὶ πλὴν φοινίκων ὅσον ἐν τετρακισχίλοις καὶ τετρακοσίοις ἢ τριακοσίοις ἐξεταζομένη σταδίοις καταστρέφουσα εἰς ποταμὸν μέγιστον τῶν ταύτῃ καλούμενων Ὀρόατιν. Ammianus Marcellinus xxiii. 6. 26 his tractibus Susiani iunguntur apud quos non multa sunt oppida, inter alia tamen eminet Susa, saepe domicilium regum, et Arsiana et Sele et *Aracha*, cetera breuia sunt et obscura, fluiui uero multa per haec loca discurrunt quibus praestant Oroates et Harax et Mosaeus per harenosas angustias quae a Rubro prohibent Caspium mare aequoream multitudinem inundantes. Compare the *τίναγος ἀμυώδες* of Ptolemy 6. 3.

ib. 173:

et ferro tellus, pontus *confunditur* aere.

This is the tradition; but the editors with distressing monotony give the Renaissance conjecture *confunditur*, a compound verb as unnecessary as it is unattested. To this even *conscinditur*, another Italian conjecture, would have been preferable. We may, however, agree that *confunditur* is impossible and that *findo* rather than *scindo* will provide the right idea; cf. Ovid *Ars. Am.* 2. 671 'aut mare remigiis aut uomere *findite terras*.' Restoring *finditur*, we want a longer word than *pontus*. Now *pontus* differs hardly at all from *nept(ū)us*, for the *ū* would easily fall out; and we have just had two examples of letter-shifting in *Araccaeis* and *Gyndes*. When *finditur* had been miswritten *funditur* and the nominative shortened by a syllable, to clap a *con* on to *funditur* was the most obvious way of making up a verse. *Neptunus* for *mare* is a licence of the poets which Lucretius reprehends at 2. 652 and employs at 472. Its use for the element was in no way fettered by its use for the god; and *neptunum findere* would be just as natural as *Neptuno immergere*, Virg. *G.* 4. 29.

J. P. POSTGATE.

THE ZEUGMA IN HORACE *EPODE XV.*

Nox erat et caelo fulgebat luna sereno
inter minora sidera,
cum tu magnorum numen laesura deorum
in verba iurabas mea,
artius atque hedera procera astringitur ilex
lentis adhaerens brachiis,
dum pecori lupus et nautis infestus Orion
turbaret hibernum mare
intonsosque agitaret Apollinis aura capillos,
fore hunc amorem mutuum.

In vol. xv. *C.R.* p. 404 ff., Mr. A. E. Housman discusses at some length the instances of Zeugma in Latin literature, and desires to place lines 7 and 8 of the above passage under that category. Careful consideration of his arguments leaves me convinced of the erroneous character of former interpretations; but I am far from being convinced that Mr. Housman's own view is correct. None of the adduced examples is so harsh, none leaves so much to the reader's imagination; only a clairvoyant or Mr. Housman would have seen what Horace intended to say in that which he has said.

I endorse heartily Mr. Housman's exhortation to think, to endeavour to disentangle the thought from the expression instead of supplementing the latter by figments from our own imagination. But I hold that in all examples of Zeugma, there is some respect for logical thought, some law, though the fragmentary expression of that law may seem 'unlaw.' Language is the expression of thought; therefore, thought is the tribunal before which language must be justified ultimately. Latin was a clear medium of expression for thought: this was the very genius of that language. No Roman writer recognised more than Horace the value of correct well-ordered thought, that

Scribendi recte sapere est et principium et fons.

He never descends to Persius' *préciosité* of expression, much less to mental puzzles which call to mind the 'altar' of Dosiades or the 'Syrinx' of Theocritus.

Taking Mr. Housman's examples in detail, I find that in all of them the thought is clear: that either the language expresses a specific idea where a generic idea is predominant in thought, or more rarely a generic idea where in thought the emphasis is upon a specific idea.

The examples from Latin literature can hardly be said to be 'more licentious' than the Zeugma which Mr. Housman would have us foist on Horace.

These examples are:—

Virgil *Georg.* i. 92 sq.

Ne tennes pluviae rapidive potentia solis
acrior aut Boreae penetrabile frigus *adurat*.

Virgil is treating of the relation of the weather—rain, sunshine, and frost—to the state of the soil. This relation is in thought at first merely a generic one: we may call it the idea of *affecting* or *rendering*. But when this idea becomes expressed, the proximity of the last of the three subjects specialises and sharpens the generic idea into one of 'affecting with dryness,' 'rendering dry.' It is a case of *Assimilation through Contiguity*.

Sen. *Herc. Oct.* 335–8.

Ante ab occasu dies
nascetur, Indos ante glacialis polus
Seythasve tepida Phoebus *inficiet* rota
quam me relictam Thessalae aspiciant nurus

Here too we have a generic idea of 'changing,' 'affecting' specialised by the context into one of 'affecting with heat (tanning).'

Cic. *ad Att.* x. 4. 4.

fortunam quâ ille florentissima, nos duriore
conflictati videmur (Tyrrell and Purser;
quacum).

Here we have a transition from the generic notion of 'laden' to the specific one of 'crushed'; or if 'quacum' is correct, from a notion of 'meeting' to one of 'meeting with adversity': *duriore* gives the specific colouring.

In [Ov.] *Her.* xix. 111, 2.

Vel pudor hic utinam qui nos clam cogit
amare,
vel timidus famae cedere vellet amor

we have a predominant notion of 'giving way, yielding' specialised by the context into 'yielding to sense of decency.' But would it not be simpler to take *famae* as genitive with *timidus*? Ovid as well as Horace uses this construction. *Cedere*, then, will be taken in an absolute sense 'to die away, cease.' Thus 'Oh that either our

sense of decency which makes our love a secret intrigue, or Love itself, since it dreads Mrs. Grundy, might cease !'

Hor. *Serm.* ii. 2, 11, 13.

seu pila velox,
molliter austerum studio fallente laborem,
seu te discus agit, pete cedentem aera disco.

Here the predominant thought is the generic notion of *playing, tossing something into the air*. The proximity of the second clause, 'seu te discus agit,' gives a special character to the thought as expressed, viz. *ludere disco*.

Lucan vii. 323-5.

Sive quis infesto cognata in pectora ferro
ibit, seu nullum violabit vulnere pignus,
ignoti iugulum tanquam scelus imputet
hostis.

Here we have a variation of the usual phenomenon. The predominant thought is the special one, viz. : 'Murder of a *relative* is to be a merit in your eyes.' The second clause, 'seu nullum violabit vulnere pignus' implies a wider denotation, to use the terms of formal logic : consequently, owing to the proximity of this clause, the connotation of the thought as expressed is enlarged into 'Murder of any kind is to be a merit' : i.e. the generic thought is the one which finds expression.

Zeugma, therefore, considered as an expression of thought, amounts to this : the special character of the context may specialise the expression of a generic thought or, more rarely, the generic character of the context may give a generic expression to an idea in which, for thought, there is a specific character. Now, in *Epodes* xv. 7, 8, according to Mr. Housman there is a double zeugma : two generic notions of 'vexing' and of 'place,' find only specific expression as *turbaret, mare*. This might be illustrated thus :

- (1) Nautae : pecus :: sea : fold.
generic notion of 'place.'
- (2) Orion : lupus :: storm : alarm in fold.
generic notion of 'vexing.'

Now this, though it is far more complicated than the cited examples, has at first sight a certain plausibility. But closer consideration will show that the thought of l. 7 is too intimately connected to admit of a 'splitting,' by the insertion of some such supplement as *terreret ovilia* or the like. Place a comma after *pecori*, and the result is

nonsense. *Infestus* must be taken with *pecori* and *nautis*, and that too in *one continuous* thought. On the word *infestus* lies the whole burden of the analogy. Orion is the foe of sailors, as the wolf is the foe of the flock. To weaken this link (in syntax as well as in thought) is to weaken the force of the analogy. Mr. Housman seems to see this point in part : he takes *pecori* with *infestus*, and not as a *dat. incommodi* after [*terreret*]. But he fails to recognise that the thought-supplement interrupts this connection. If it were not for this stress on *infestus*, we might ask why Horace had not written something like 'dum *pecudem* lupus.' The sense of this closeness of connection (by means of *infestus*) lies perhaps at the basis of Kiessling's otherwise fatuous remark that 'turbaret hibernum mare' is really a relative clause which had been attracted into the position of a predicative owing to the parallel 'agitaret aura.' Even the time-worn '*infestus foret*' places the emphasis rightly upon *infestus*. Both these views involve barbaric syntax ; but Mr. Housman, who would have us 'think,' places an equally severe strain on the thought. We have at one and the same time to hold fast, keep close together, the two terms of the analogy—the wolf's hostility to the flock, and Orion's hostility to the sailor—and to 'split' this connected thought by some such supplement as *terreret ovilia*.

It remains, therefore, either to assume with L. Mueller the loss of two lines, or that there is some corruption. I incline to the latter alternative. There is no Zeugma, and lines 7, 8 form one continuous thought. Mr. Allen (*C.R.* xvi. p. 305) placed his finger on the difficulty when he remarked that *lupus* was corrupt. I suggest that these lines, as originally written, were

dum *pecori lips* et *nautis infestus* Orion
turbaret hibernum mare.

Lips might easily have been mistaken for an abbreviation of *lupus* (*lup̄s*). The proximity of *pecori* would have suggested *lupus* to a monastic scribe acquainted with Is. 11, 6 (Hieron.) 'Habitabit *lupus* cum agno et pardus cum haedo accubabit ;' just as this same verse was responsible for 'cum bove *pardus*' where Horace wrote cum bove pagus (*Carm.* iii. 18. 12). The south winds were pestilential to cattle. In Persius—an ardent Horatian—we have

Hic ego securus vulgi et quid praeparet
Auster
infelix pecori (vi. 12).

Virgil *Georg.* i. 444.

Arboribusque satisque *Notus* pecorique
sinister.

Claudian, talking of the northern side of Sardinia, says that the North winds are unable to reach the land owing to the barrier of the hills called *Insani Montes* :—

hinc hominum *pecudumque lues* : hinc pesti-
fer aer
saevit et exclusis regnant Aquilonibus *Austri*
(*Bell. Gild.* 514, 5).

Hor. *C.* iii. 23. 5 calls the *Africus* 'pestilens.' In *C.* ii. 14. 15, 16 we find

frustra per auctumnos nocentem
corporibus metuemus *Austrum*.

Theocritus ix. 11 shows how the violence of the south wind was dreaded by the herdsmen,

δαμαλῶν . . . τὰς μοὶ ἀπώσας
Ἀψ κόμαρον τραγούσας ἀπὸ σκοπιάς ἐτίναξε.

Lines 7, 8 express a single picture of storm as contrasted with the thought of l. 9, in which we have a picture of fair sunny weather : in fact, the contrast is like that in

C. iii. 29. 43–5. It should not be a serious objection to the word *Lips* that it only appears in Pliny and Seneca. This objection would hold equally against such a word as *Apeliotes* (Catullus), which is not found again in any writer before Pliny. The Poet like the man of the street did not observe any fine distinctions between *Auster*, *Notus*, *Lips* (*Libonotus*), *Africus*. Pliny, *Hist.* ii. 46 speaks of all as south winds : a meridio *Auster*, at ab occasu brumali *Africus* ; *Noton* et *Liba* nominant. He says, also, that south winds caused the greatest storms at sea, that they were unhealthy, and were accompanied by rain and copious dew (*Hist.* ii. 48, xviii. 76, 77). That these rain-bringing winds were undesirable we see from Hor. *C.* i. 17 :—

Velox amoenum saepe *Lucretilem*
mutat *Lycae* *Faunus* et igneam
defendit aestatem *capellis*
usque meis *pluviosque ventos*.

'*Pluvius*,' '*umidus*' are standing epithets of *Auster* (v. Pliny *l.c.*, Virgil, *Georg.* i. 462, Ovid, *M.* i. 66).

E. H. ALTON.

ON HORACE *EPODE* XV. 5 AND SENECA *HERC. OET.* 335 sqq.

I SHOULD leave Mr. Alton's searching criticism of Professor Housman's exposition of Zeugma and his defence of his own ingenious emendation to the reader if I had not long felt that on two of the passages concerned I had a word to say.

On Horace *Epod.* xv. 7 sq. I agree with Professor Housman that the commentators' ellipse of *infestus esset* with *pecori lupus* is impossible, and with Mr. Alton that Professor Housman's zeugma, '*Terret ouilia* or *what you will*' (my italics), is inadmissible. But for the benefit of those who are not prepared to accept Mr. Alton's correction I would point out that there is an employment of *turbare* which will provide the passage of the conception with the bridge which Mr. Alton most reasonably requires. This is the absolute or intransitive usage of Varro, *R.R.* 3. 17. 7 '*cum mare turbaret*,' of Livy 38. 13. 12 '*tum quoque equites in agnen Romanum eruptione facta haud modice primo impetu turbauere*,' of Lucretius 5. 502–4 '*nec liquidum corpus turbantibus aeris auris | commiscet : sinit haec uiolentis*

omnia uerti | turbinibus, sinit incertis turbare procellis' (for further examples see Munro's note on Lucr. 2. 126), and of other writers cited in the lexicons. One passage from Virgil has a special pertinence to the present inquiry.

inpastus ceu plena leo per ouilia turbans
(suadet enim uesana fames) manditque
trahitque
molle pecus.—*Aen.* 9. 339 sqq.

Those then who would keep to the tradition here may do so by assuming that Horace's expression slid from one legitimate use of *turbare* to another. Thus '*dum lupus infestus pecori turbaret* (neuter, sc. '*per ouilia*' or '*in ouilibus*') et Orion nautis infestus hibernum mare turbaret' (active).

Seneca *Herc. Oet.* 335 sqq. should on the other hand be struck out of the list of zeugmas, in which it was included because 'It will not do to supply *inficiet*, since *inficere* unqualified does not mean to *bleach* and does mean to *tan*. Horace says "*albus ora pallor*

inficit" but that is no defence of "polus Indos inficiet" for "inficiet pallore" (*C.R.* xv. p. 405). This argument is disposed of by Tibullus ii. 2. 19 *sq.* 'uincula quae

maneant semper dum tarda senectus Inducat rugas inficietque comas.'

J. P. POSTGATE.

ON THE MONTPELLIER MANUSCRIPTS OF PERSIUS AND JUVENAL.

THROUGH the courtesy of the French Government I was enabled in the summer of 1902 to examine the two Montpellier manuscripts of Persius and Juvenal, which were sent for my use to Oxford. As the excellent description by Beer of the MS. No. 125 (Pithoeanus) requires correcting and supplementing in some respects; and as the other MS. (No. 212) has not been fully described, the following observations will perhaps be not without interest.

I.

The Montpellier MS. No. 125 is a vellum manuscript, consisting of nine quaternions: the first is not numbered, the others are (iii Q. etc., but the ninth thus viiii, without Q.). The last quaternion has an extra leaf attached at the end: it seems to have had originally two such leaves, but one was cut off. There are three blank paper sheets at the beginning, none at the end. The pages contain 29 lines of text on a page. The manuscript is written in a fine hand, in caroline minuscules, 'about A.D. 900, and the glosses very little later' (F. Madan). The inscriptions at the beginning of the satires are in rustic capitals. The ruling of the pages is of an uncommon type in two ways: (1) any two pages which face one another are different in rulings, except at the middle of a gathering, and where two gatherings meet, (2) the ruling is to a large extent, perhaps always, done to two sheets at one operation, beyond any doubt at all. The ruling for the scholia is, in places at all events, an afterthought: which may suggest a question whether the scholia were in the original of which the manuscript is a copy. Most probably they were not: but are copied from a distinct but kindred manuscript. The placing of the skins is normal: the outside of any quaternion is the yellow side of the skin. Thus p. 1 is yellow, pp. 2, 3 are white, pp. 4, 5 yellow, etc. I have to thank Mr. T. W. Jackson for assistance towards these observations.

The first vellum page, not counted in

enumerating, is blank: but at the beginning has *P. Pithouj.* On the reverse side are these lines (Beer, *Spicilegium* p. 10) in a fifteenth century hand:

Ad boreae partes arcti uertuntur et anguis.
Post has artofilax pariterq; corona genuq;
Prolapsus lyra auis cepheus et casiepea
Auriga et perseus thelthoton (*sic*) et andromedae astrum.
Pegasus et delphin.

There is a hole in the parchment where e has fallen out. Then follow the Latin prayers, as given by Beer. Then follows fol. 1 (described by Beer p. 10). At the top of the page is

Persius Mathias ix 69
Iuuenalis

in a fifteenth century hand. Then, in a hand contemporary with the MS., but not the same, are given again the lines *Ad boreae*—*casiephia* (*sic*); and pious texts such as *nox exultationis et salutis in tabernaculis iustorum*, and the number MD·LXXIII. Then again come the lines *Ad boreae* thus:

Ad boreae partes arcti uertuntur et anguis.
Post has artofilax pariterq; corona genuq;
Prolapsus lyra auis cepheus et casiepia.
Auriga et perseus theltoton (*sic*) et andromedae astrum.
Pegasus et delphin telumq; aquila anguitenensq; (*sic*).
Signifer inde subest bis sex hunc sydera cōplent.
¹ hinc Aries taurus gemini cancer leo uirgo.
Libra scorpio asbitenens (*sic*) capricornus et urnam.
Qui tenet et pisces post sunt in partibus auri.
Orion pchion lepus ardens syrius argo.

¹ hinc added in margin by a hand a little later perhaps sec. x.

Hydrus · chiron · turibulum quoq;
piscis et ingens¹
Insequitur pisinx pistrix simul
heridaniq; fluenta.

At the bottom of the page are short arguments of the satires in a fifteenth century hand. They are

In prima satira Iuuenalis per totum agit de abusionibus romanorum.

In 2^a inuehitur in adulteros opera muliebria exercentes et in philosophos fictos qui alios corripere nolunt de uitii quibus ipsi subiecti sunt.

In 3^a inuehitur in nequitias romanorum in reducendo amicum suum umbricium recedentem a ciuitate romana.

In 4^a in gulosos et hoc sub umbra crispini et neronis.

In 5^a in scurras et parasitos sub umbra trepii.

In secundo libro inuehitur in adulteras et nequitias earundem.

In tertio libro in prima satira inuehitur in reges et principes qui poetas non remunerant.

In 2^a in illos qui nolunt esse nobiles et opera nobilium non exercentes.

In 3^a reprehendit iuuenes diuitibus seruientibus (*sic. seruientes mg. m. rec.*) in opera luxurie.

In quarto libro in prima satira inuehitur in illos qui mundana appetunt.

In 2^a in pauperes splendide epulantes.

In 3^a in heredipetas et de catullo.

In quinto libro Iuuenalis In prima satira inuehitur in illos qui inconsolabiliter dolent de amissione rerum temporalium.

In 2^a in parentes filios male instruentes.

In 3^a arguit egiptios propter mirabilem cultum eorum diuinorum.

In 4^a narrat commoda militum et hoc sub quadam reprehensione.

Below this is *Ex libris oratorii Collegii Trecentis.*

On the last page, 80^v, at the top is Laurisheim (*i.e.* Lorsch) written twice over: then P PITHEV: then

Codex sc̃i nazarii Martiris xpi
Qui cupit hunc librum sibimet contendere prium
Hic flegetonetas patiatul sulphure flammaz.

C<odex> Monasterii D. Nazarii In Bergstrasse Wormacensium agri Larina <ti> uteratum (?) ubi Thasillo Baiuvarum dux s martis colit.
[There is nothing about 1576 Pithou, as

¹ et ingens is added by a hand sec. x.

Beer asserts p. 12.] Against this on the left margin is written 1576 EVOAE: then follow some lines of religious scribbling, *e.g.* Quomodo cantauimus canticum domini in terra aliena ac iam (?) septuaginta annos super flumina babylonis sedimus. Then the lines *Qui cupit—flammaz* are repeated.

I notice the following points as supplementary to the description given by Beer. The manuscript is carefully punctuated: the sign; being used for a full stop, the sign for a comma. A few specimens of the punctuation will be not uninteresting: vii. 13 ff.

Hoc satius · quam si dicas sub iudice · uidi
Quod non uidisti · faciant //equites asiani
Quamquam · et cappadoces faciant · equites-
que bitini ·

Altera quos nudo traducit gallica talo;
Nemo tamen studiis indignum ferre laborem
etc.

xi. 111 ff.

Templorum quoque maiestas · praesentior.
et uox

Nocte fere media · mediamque audita per
urbem ·

Litore ab oceani gallis uenientibus · et diis
Officium uatis peragentibus; his monuit nos;
Hanc rebus latis curam praestare solebat ·
Fictilis et nullo uiolatus iuppiter auro;

xi. 148.

Quisquam erit · in magno cum posces pasce
latinae;

xiii. 38 ff.

Quondam hoc indigenae uiuebant more ·
priusquam
Sumeret agrestem · posito diademate falcem
Saturnus fugiens · tunc cum uirguncula
iuno ·

Et priuatis adhuc //ideis iuppiter antris ·
Nulla super nubes conuiuia caelicolarum ·
Nec puer iliacus · formosa nec herculis uxor
At cyatos · etiam siccato nectare tergens
Bracchia uulcanus · liparae nigra taberna;
Prandebat sibi quisque deus · nec turba
deorum

Talis ut est hodie · contentaque sidera paucis
Numinibus · miserum urgebant Atlanta
minori
Pondere; nondum aliquis sortitus triste
profundi

Imperium · aut sicala toruus cum coniuge
pluto ·

Nec rota · nec furiae · nec saxum · aut uulturis
atri

Poena; infernis bilares · sine regibus umbrae;

xiii. 186 ff.

Qui partem acceptae saeva inter uincla
cicutae.

Accusatori nollet dare; plurima felix

Paulatim uitia · adque errores exiit omnes;

Prima docet rectum sapientia; quippe
minuti

Semper · et infirmi est animi · exiguique
uoluptas

Vltio; continuo sic collige quod uindicta

Nemo magis gaudet quam femina; cur
tamen hos tu

Euasisse putes · quos diri conscia facti

Mens habet attonitos · et surdo verbere
caedit.

Oeculum quatiente animo tortore flagellum?

Diphthongs are usually written in full: sometimes however by means of a cedilla beneath the e, as *signatę tabulę* (ii. 119), *cremerę* (ii. 155), *lacertę* (iii. 231). Sometimes both ways of writing are employed, as *miseræ magnęque* (iv. 74). Sometimes the diphthong is not indicated, as *sæue* (iii. 8), *que* (iii. 234), *Que* (vi. 253). Frequently *ae* is written for *e*, as *praemit* (iii. 244), *uariae* (iii. 264), *aepulas* (iv. 28), *spraeti* (vi. 226), *dubiae* (vi. 375), *praessit* (vi. 621), *adquae* (x. 295).

Words are frequently wrongly divided, examples are ii. 50 *His posubīt*, vi. 46 *per-tundit euenā*, 101 *prandente terrat*, 136 *Optimas et*, 259 *cycla dequarum*, 352 *con-ducito gulnis*, 638 *uanis et*, vii. 145 *basil-usr ara*, viii. 66 *epire dia*, xi. 17 *peritura maccessere*, xii. 13 *laetas et*, xiv. 7 *raderet ubera*, xiv. 113 *fortunas eruet*, xv. 61 *mili//at urbe*, 112 *retoret hyle*, 116 *nefandit aurica*, 133 *par soptima*, 167 *Adsuetico quaere*; Pers. i. 80 *quaeris neunde*, 93 *bere cynthius*, 108 *ui desis*, 113 *pueris acer*, iii. 15 *hunc inererum*, 29 *consorem uetuum*, iv. 14 *summane quicquam*, 16 *anti cyeras*, 21 *pannu ciabaucis*, v. 80 *Crederet unum mos*, 137 *iras et*, 183 *tum et alba fide liauino*, 191 *centus eligetur*, vi. 33 *tabulas et*, 71 *saturans eris*.

The most noticeable confusions of letters are these: (1) *a* and *o*, vi. 561 *longa for longo*, 571 *lucra for lucro*, conversely x. 326 *repulso for repulsa*: (2) *b* and *u* (v), this confusion is most frequent: iii. 273 *inprobidus for inprouidus*, vi. 8 *turbabit for turbauit*, 390 *putabit for putauit*, 626 *benefica for uenefica*, vii. 58 *uiuendis for bibendis*, 153 *cantauit for cantabit*, viii. 204 *bibrata for uibrata*, ix. 98 *ualbis for ualuis*, 117 *uiuebat for bibebat*, 128 *uiuinus for bibimus*, x. 70 *probat for probauit*, xi. 187 *uilem for bilem*, 203 *uiuat for bibat*, xii. 4 *bellus*

for uellus, 112 *Pacubium for Pacuuium* (so 125, 128), xiii. 155 *bobis for bouis*, 205 *probat for probauit*, xiv. 134 *negauit for negabit*, 163 *uina for bina*, 296 *trauibis for trabibus*, xv. 21 *ueruere for uerbere*, 126 *rauiæ for rabie*, 163 *rauida for rabida*; Pers. ii. 27 *uidental (originally) for bidental*, iii. 8 *uilis for bilis*, iii. 93 *rogauit for roga-bit*, iv. 12 *curba for curua*, 49 *uiiuce for uibice*, 50 *uibulas for bibulas*, v. 97 *uiti-aui for uitiauit*, v. 112 *salibam for saliuam*, 168 *plorauit for plorabit*, 169 *obiurgauere for obiurgabere*, vi. 16 *cur bus for curuus*, 55 *bobillas for bouillas*: (3) *c* and *g*, iii. 192 *cabiis for gabiiis*, 199 *ucaleon for ucalegon*, 204 *abagi for abaci*, 263 *stricili-bus for strigilibus*, 319 *refigi for refici*, v. 141 *mygale for mycale*, vi. 147 *emun-geris for emungeris*; Pers. iii. 104 *grassis for crassis*: (4) *d* and *t* are frequently confused, especially *ad* for *at*, e.g. i. 65, iii. 246, *adque for atque*: (5) *d* and *r* are often confused, e.g. *reliquid for reliquit* (vi. 88): (6) *l* appears for *i*, iii. 40 *locati for iocati*, vi. 64 *tucelaue scae for Tuccia uesicae*, vi. 113 *Velento for Viento*.

Lines are transposed at xiii. 139, 140. A line is inserted by mere error vii. 211. Deliberate insertions are found at ix. 134, xiv. 1, 2. A line is omitted x. 67. Among spellings the following may be noted: *octoginsima* iv. 92, but *octogensimus* vi. 192, *paelex* vi. 227. *Pollio* vii. 176, ix. 7, but *Pollio* vi. 387, xi. 43, *brachia* vi. 421 and often, but *bracchia* xiii. 45, *epistula* x. 71, but *epistola* xvi. 5, *formonsa* vi. 465, *praegnatem* vi. 405, *praegnas* i. 122, *coturnus* vi. 506, 634, vii. 72, xv. 29, *quaerella* xiii. 135, xvi. 19, *solatia* xiii. 179, *uultus* ix. 12, xiv. 52, but *uoltus* vii. 238, viii. 205, xv. 170, *uulgus* ii. 74, iii. 36 etc., but *uolgi* vii. 85, viii. 44; Pers. vi. 12, *pinnis* xiv. 76, *neclegit for neglegit*, ix. 92 (though this may be due to confusion of *c* and *g*), *sequuntur* x. 58, *fascia* xiv. 294, but *fascia* vi. 263, *captiuos* x. 136, *toruos* xiii. 50, but *ecus* xi. 103, *sepulchrum* x. 146, but *sepulcrum* vi. 230, *exorbeat* x. 223, *holuscula* xi. 79, but *olus* Pers. iii. 112, vi. 20, *reliquum* Pers. v. 87, vi. 68 (bis), *urgueat* iv. 59, *urguet* xiii. 220; so also vi. 425, 593, xii. 53, xiii. 48, *tinguat* Pers. vi. 20, *faenus* ix. 140, Pers. vi. 67, but *fenus* xi. 40, 48, 185, *sollers* ix. 65, Pers. v. 37, 142, vi. 24, but *sollers* vi. 75, *decies* x. 335, xiii. 136, Pers. vi. 79.

II.

The Montpellier manuscript of Persius No. 212 (Fonds de Bouhier D. 44) in Mr.

Madan's opinion dates from the second half of the ninth century. It is written in caroline minuscules on vellum, and is a small quarto having eight leaves to the quaternion. It contains glosses and a few marginal scholia, but not many. Its contents are (1) Nonius Marcellus, (2) Persius, (3) the verses of Priscian (1) *De est et non*, which are thus introduced: UERSUS · PRISCIANI · ELOQUENTISSIMI · DE · EST · ET · N · INCIP. These verses are printed in Riese's *Anthologia Latina*, No. 645, where they are assigned to Ausonius. As this manuscript was unknown to Riese I subjoin a collation of these verses with his text: the verses are on fol. 79 recto and verso: 2 nichil, 3 Omnia in his ab his, 4 otii quietis, 5 nūquā sepe seorsū, 6 studiis studio ingeniumque, 7 Et facilis uel difficilis, 8 interueniens est, 9 Incontrouersum, 10 foras furios *sic*, 11 cuneati hinc leta theatro, 12 quoque omitted, 14 loquentis, 15 scola, 16 agitat placido certamine, 18 Estne dies est ergo dies, 19 fulgoribus quotiens, 23 *sic*.

After these verses follows the following INCIPIUNT GRAMMATICAE ARTIS NOMINA GRECE ET LATINE NOTATA, extending from fol. 79^v to 81^r, where the MS. ends. This is a glossary, which begins as follows:

Poeta · uates ·
Grammaticus · doctor liberariū (*sic*)
Poeticus liber uel cantus ·
Perfora · Interrogatio · Antifora responsio.

The truncated subscriptio (see the note to my edition at the bottom of p. 1 of the preface) in my opinion and that of Mr. Madan relates to Persius, and not, as Lucian Müller has carelessly asserted, to Nonius (Müller, *Nonius* ii. 260). It is not by the hand which wrote the manuscript, but by another contemporary hand, possibly the hand which wrote the scholia and glosses, viz. the contemporary corrector. It was written in the upper half of the page, fol. 66^r, in the margin beside the text of Nonius, simply because there was space for it there, rather than beside Persius. For Persius is enriched with large capital letters at the beginning of each line, which occupy a great part of the margin. Nonius on the other hand has no such capital letters, and the lines therefore begin rather farther back into the page. Further, there are no glosses, notes, etc., on Nonius at all; while there are plenty on Persius. The subscriptio was in my judgement copied from some other MS. of Persius employed for purposes of correction.

Persius begins immediately with Sat. i. 1,

O curas, etc., fol. 66^v. The choliambi are placed at the end, on fol. 78^v. They are preceded by the following in capital letters: PERSII FLACCI SATYRARUM EXPLICIT VITA EIUSDĒ. There is, however, no Vita in the MS. It stood probably in the archetype; or the expression may refer to the choliambi. Then follows, fol. 79^r, the subscriptio FLAUII · IUL · TRĒ · NN · SABINI UT PŌTECTOR DOMESTICUS TEMPTAUI EMENDARE SINE ANTIGRAPHO ME² ET ADNOTAUI BARCELONE C²SS D²S NN AR|CKADIO ET HONORIO Q. By adnotauī is meant, I think, 'punctuated': there are stops in the manuscript. The following noteworthy spellings are found: quum (iv. 22), filix (iv. 41), uulpem (v. 117), uulgi (vi. 12), littore (vi. 29), foenoris (vi. 67).

III.

The following notes are necessary to supplement the published collations of Bücheler and myself, which, it will be seen, are not always in agreement. Bücheler's collation of the Pithoeanus was executed with admirable care; but I have had the advantage of being able to revise his work.

MONTEPESSULANUS 125 (P).

Persius i. 34 unum *sic*: the n is not 'in rasura' (Büch.) but only rather faded; 57 sesquipede: the ses is by m 2 in ras.; 72 pallia: the lili is in ras. I think the original word was parilia.

ii. 2 labentis m 1 -es m 2, 47 liquescant m 1 -unt m 2.

iii. 7 ita nec *sic*: ita and nec both expunged by a later hand, which has written nunc above. 14 quo (ut supra m 2). 17 similes m 1 -is m 2. 80 Obsti//po: in the erasure is, I think, an ill-formed p.

iv. 34 tangat m 1, te contingat *sic* m 2.

v. 16 ingenuo, I agree with Büch. that the u has been altered from ib. 19 above pullatis is written palliatis, a fifteenth century gloss. 159 arrumpit (i.e. arripit): above this is written exipit in a fifteenth century hand. 187 infantes.

vi. 16 Cur bus (v supr. m 2) obit (-d m 2), 35 da^{bit} the whole word written in ras. by m 2: da is not, as Büch. states, by m 1.

52 //iusta (x m 2). 65, 66 are thus written Quidquid id est · ubi sit fuge quaere quod mihi

Quondam legerat tadius neu dicta pone paterna

(the a above the line by m 2).

Juvenal i. 45 siccum (c inserted by m 2): m 1 had si cum, not, as Büch. states sitcum or sucum, 67 falsi m 1 altered to falso by m 2,

106 purpuræ ma//or: the e added by m 2: the a above the line also by m 2: further in the erasure i added by m 2. The first hand had purpura maior, which was altered by m 2 to purpuræ amator: this was subsequently altered back to purpura maior, 161 uerym: the vm is by m 3 in ras.: further in marg. is written uel uerbum by m 4, a late hand. The original hand had uerbum not ueruum: this is clear from the shape of the erasure.

ii. 1 glaciale/// (m clear under the erasure), 13 medico /// ridente, 41 spiranto p//obalsama originally probalsama, I think. 159 arma in ras. added by m 2: what m 1 had cannot be decyphered, 160 /// iuuerne /// m 2: what m 1 had underneath it is impossible to see. The scholium is litoralia p. p. idem [not id est] uincendo etc.

iii. 109 stands thus in the MS.

Praeterea. sanctum nihil abinguine tutum.

The est neq, above is by m 2. (Bücheler's note is wrong.) 207 opizi (zi m 2 in ras.) opifici seems to have been the reading of m 1, the extent of the erasure corresponds to it. Further it is found in the lemma of the scholium inadequately reported by Büch. Et diuina opifici opizin graeci dicunt etc. 303 deerit.

iv. 9 uittata written quite clearly, not in any way altered (as Büch. states): above it is the gloss redimiculis ligata uittis redimitis (sic) sicut sacerdos, 25 praetios quam e m 1 praetium squame et potuit m 2. Above quam stands the gloss piscis fuit [i.e. hoc pretium piscis fuit], 45 the inter-linear gloss is transmittit propter magnitudinem, not prae magnitudine, as Lommatzsch wrongly, Quaest. Iuv. p. 418. 96 iam ex tam m 2 (m 1 had tam), I regret that there is an error in my note here. 148 et is a mere slip in the MS. for ex; the two words being written much alike by the scribe.

v. 82 despiciat the i has been refreshed (Büch. wrongly reports despictat), 91 omitted in the text, added in marg. by a hand as ancient as the original and possibly the same, 117 facient m 1 faciunt m 2 (faciunt is erroneously assigned to P in my note).

vi. 129 rigida /// entigine m 1 (corr. m 2), 151 above in is written sed est by m 2 (Lommatzsch inaccurate here), 153 iasum i by m 1, all the rest by m 2, 187 maera ce cropis m 1 in ras. Over maera is the gloss pura quasi naturalis, over cecropis is uel atheni-

ensis. 224 uiros et m 1 (corr. m 2), 244 formantque (for in ras.), 281 dic // under the erasure is e I think, i.e. dice (Neue II.² 438), 306 Inunget corrected above by erasure not 'in margine' (Büch.), 435 uergilium m 1

uulg. m 2, 548 /// I think uel was the word erased; being indistinctly written, it was erased and written above by m 2, 549 calidae (ca refreshed merely), 603 petitos (s in ras. m. ead.), 655 et ibi belides (a line is drawn under et ibi by m 2).

vii. 14 // equites, 35 facundae t nupta (the mark of division (Λ), t, and erasure of n by m 2 (Büch. incorrect), 77 lenioribē belua the first be erased: this is quite clear. In mg. uel leniori belua m 2 (Büch. incorrect), 124 licet m 1 quantum petet mg. m 2 (petet in ras., what was beneath cannot be decyphered, it may have been petit or libet), 145 basilus rara (lus r in ras. m 2: m 1 had basilus ara wrongly divided), 204 Sicut (cut merely refreshed by the original hand) /// tisimachi (li m 2 in ras., under the ras. is clearly thra. There is no trace of y, as Büch. states. 219 palemon // (on refreshed by m 2. Probably m 1 had palemom), 239 coetus (o m 2) m 1 had caetus, not quetus.

viii. 18 funestat (tat in litura), 40 the scholium should read quia blandus rebellius dicebatur superbus. est nobilitate etc., 83 nefas—praeferre refreshed in ras., 97 na//lū (u written in the ras. by an ancient or possibly the same hand), 104 the scholium runs Ra re sine mentore mensae. id est quae a fabro nobili non sunt facte. Rem. sine toreumatae, 148 multo sufflamine in ras.: no doubt the original reading was sufflamine mulio, 162 cyane (e m 2 in ras. Perhaps -is under the ras.; but this is uncertain; the letter may be merely refreshed). 163 dic& (& m 2 in ras., under which clearly is it), 172 om legatum the gloss is damasippum (not damasippi as Lommatzsch states).

a itos gar efed-
ix. 37 thus ΔΥΤΟC|ΓΑΡ|ΕΦΕΔ-
kete ianaga sinaidos
ΚΕΤΕ|ΙΑΝΑΓΑ|CΙΝΑΙΔΟC the Latin
letters above are, I think, by the original hand.
In mg. at top of page m 2 has

ΓΑΙΚΟC

Sollicitent ΔΤΗΩC ΓΑΙΥΓΗΥCΙΝ
K

ΔΑΝΔΡΑ ΓΗΝΕΔΩC i. dulces mores
mollis uiri

40 the scholium is Computat: fiat computatio. ceuet crisat.

x. 30 the scholium runs Pro'tuleratque p.

id est non est mirandus adsiduus illius risus. sed mirandum est unde lacrimae tantae abundarant heraclito. 247 fuita (a in ras.), 325 the scholium runs Hippolito id est quid profuit castitas ippolito et bellerophonti non propter eadem nati sunt.

xi. 24 athlans m 1 athlas m 2, 91 fabricios (os m 2 in ras.: probably um was in the erasure, but this is uncertain), 103 ecus m 1 equus m 2, 147 thus

et pro magne bibere
i

Quisquam erit in magno cum posces pasce latinae;

xiii. 9 ac m 1, supra scr. est m 2, 64 bimembri///, 65 mirandis m 1, miranti m 2 (not mirantis; the apparent s is merely the scratch on the parchment of the original s), 107 the scholium, omitted by Büch., is Confirmant t. t. s. a. Tunc te uocantem eum ad templum ut iuret praecedit, 174 peiuri ex peiori (misprinted priori in my edition).

xiv. 191 accipi // ceras (perhaps t beneath the ras.), 232 me///tisque (under the ras. was ri or n), 245 Flagrautem (l in ras., under which was r), 307 electro (tro in ras., m 2, what was the original reading cannot be deciphered).

xv. 27 iunpo (I think, but it might be iunco) m 1; altered to iunco by m 2. In mg. uel iunio by m 4, a 15th century hand, 52 horrida// (a m 2: I could not read what was beneath), 52 ardentibus (d refreshed merely by m 2), 65 alax sic, not corrected by m 2. The scholium on the line is Tela nec hunc lapidē. Id est non tam magna saxa iactant qualia antiqui, 145 ////fiendis m 1 capiendis m 2. Whatever the erased word was, the first letter does not seem to have gone below the line, as the parchment is not scratched below the line: it might have been rapiendis but not pariendis.

xvi. 52 labore ex lauore.

MONTEPESSULANUS 212.

This MS. is corrected throughout by a second hand coeval with the first, whose readings are generally ignored in printed collations. I give them here usually omitting the (known) reading of the first hand.

Pers. i. 7 quaesiuoris m 2, 8 romaest (e

supr. m 2, 22 Tunc (c deleted), 23 perditio soae (v supr. m 2), 24 Quod (d deleted), 27 sicire (corr. m 2), 36 illi m 1 ille m 2, 39 e m 2, 40 ast corrected by erasure, 45 cum scribo m 2, 53 cytreis m 2, 54 trita lacerna m 2, 57 propenso m 2, 76 quam m 2, 84 quin tepedum m 2, 85 rasis m 2, 109 canina m 2, 134 callirhoen do add. m 2.

ii. 3 murum m 1 merum m 2, 11 crepet m 2, 12 quam m 1 (corr. m 2), 15 poscas, mergis m 2, 16 purgas m 2, 55 subiit m 2, 60 facile m 1 fictile m 2, 66 massae m 2,

68 Peccae hęc (t over e by m 2), 72 magni om. messalae m 2, 75 admoneam m 1, corr. m 2.

iii. 1 Nempe m 2, 20 effluis m 2, 23 es m 2, 24 rure paterno m 2, 31 discincti m 2, 37 Mouerit m 2, 51 caliduo m, corr. m 2, 68 metae m 2, 80 Obsip m 1 Opstipo m 2, 84 De m 2, 85 quod om., add. m 2, 86 populis, 93 lauatur m 2, 99 sulphureas m 2, 100 inter uina subit m 2, 102 excutit, 117 discisque m 2.

iv. 2 ducere m 1, corr. m 2, 12 pede om., 19 inhunc m 1 i nunc m 2, 38 dectus m 1 detsus m 2, 46 dictat m 2.

v. continuous with iv. 5 carminis sic (Büchl. wrong), 26 fauces m 2, 28 pura m 2,

30 Cum m 2, 33 sparsis oculos (se supra, by either the same or a contemporary hand), 58 putris et (P has putriset), 59 fagi m 2, 61 uitā—relictā (the strokes above are, I think, by m 2), 67 diem m 2, 106 auro m 2, 115 nostrae m 2, 123 bathilli m 2, 135 lubrica m 2, 148 sessilis m 2, 149 quincimte (corr. m 2), 179 cum m 2, 183 natat m 2, 185 pericula m 2.

vi. 4 matrem (t deleted), 13 pecore m 1 -i m 2, 43 O bonum sic m 1 O bene num m 2, 49 Egregia m 1-ae m 2, 51 adeo (u supr. m 2=P), 63 relictus m 1-is m 2, 64 Deest m 2, 68 inperisuis angue m 1 inpensius ungue m 2, 75 ofito (= omento) pauentur

m 1 omento popa uenter (puella above, apparently a gloss) m 2.

CHOL. 1 Fronte (r del. m 2), 4 pirenem m 2, 8 expediunt m 2.

S. G. OWEN.

DE AUCTORE CARMINIS PERVIGILIIUM VENERIS INSCRIPTI.

QUAESTIO, si qua alia, vexatissima semper fuit, praesertim semisaeculo nuper praegresso, de auctore elegantis carminis Pervigilium Veneris praetitulati. Aldus Manutius et Erasmus Roterodamensis (aut quia in cod. miscellaneo, olim in Aldi potestate ac Pithoeano perquam simili, ita inscriberetur, aut quia Catulli c. lxii illud praecederet exciperetur, certe propioribus foliis contineretur) Catullo id tribuere non dubitarunt;¹ Catullo mimographo T. Scaliger; alii Africano, alii Siculo poetae adsignavere; plerique vero critici ex sermonis notis delabentis esse fetum latinis agnoverunt; quin etiam existit qui, C. Barthio falsa adfirmanti nimis credulus, carmen ad Th. Senecam Camertem, unum ex illis 'doctis Italis' saec. xv, referre ausus sit!² Nemo adhuc ad certos terminos aetatem poemati valuit definire, nedum verum auctoris nomen promeret confideret. Non magni tamen laboris rem criticam exercentibus fuisset utrumque expedire, modo si cum diligentia quadam ac penitiori optutu hos duos versus perscrutati essent, in codd. ita exaratos:

73 'Unde samnes (cod. Salmas.) rames (cod. Thuan.) et quirites proque prole posterum

74 Romuli matrem crearet et nepotem caesarem.'

volgo ab edd. sic impressos:

'Unde Ramnes et Quirites proque prole posterum
Romuli matrem crearet et nepotem Caesarem.'

J. Lipsius quidem, jungens 'Romuli' v. praeced., reposuit, 'patrem' J. Caesarem intellegens, nepotem autem Octavianum. Ipse, Sanadonis correctionem 'posterum' in 'postera' recipiens, versus hoc modo rescribo:

'unde Ramnes et Quirites, proque prole postera,
Romuli patrem crearet et Nepotem Caesarem.'

Ut iam liquet, HH. DD. acies falsa est hic eiusdem generis errore, quo Odysseus in spelunca Sicula Polyphemum decepit. Scilicet Romuli pater, seu Pater, designatur Romuli Augustuli, imperatorum Romanorum

postremi, genitor Orestes; *Nepos* vero *Caesar* sive caesar (= der Kaiser) dicitur Julius Nepos, imperator Romanus a die 24 junii 474 ad 31 octobris 475; quo die Orestes filium, vix pueritiam egressum, imperatoria purpura induit, rerum tamen moderamen ipse pro filio in manibus regens. Julius Nepos ab Oreste, quem legatum ac ducem militis contra Vesegothas missis praefecerat, in eum rebellante, die 28 augusti 475 Ravenna pulsus, Salonam in Delmatiam aufugit, ubi postea, die 9 maii 480, occisus est.

Cum Orestes ab Odoacre Herulorum rege vel, ut alii malunt, barbarorum militum, praecipue ex Norico, duce Ticini (Paviae) obsessus captusque, paulo post, die 28 augusti a. 476, Placentiae capite obruncatus sit, atque carmen, ut e contextu elucet, pridie kalendas apriles scriptum sit, necessario consequitur ipsius anni 476 postrema mensis martii die panxisse poetam *Veneris Pervigilium*; sin, causa ei nulla fuerit Augustuli Patrem una cum Nepote nominandi. Auctorem autem G. Sollium Sidonium, cui Apollinari volgo patronymicum accedit, esse (praeter quam quod scimus eo tempore nullum alium poetam vixisse, tam bello carmini idoneum conficiendo), ex duplici adnominatio-
ne in textu obvia pro certo evincimus: nempe 'rosa' atque 'alites'. Compertum habemus Sidonio fuisse unam filiam nomine Rosciam; quae utrum una eademque sit cum alia Sidonii filia in eius epistulis memorata, Severiana, ambigitur; verum tamen ex 'unica' v. 26 *Perv. Ven.* et quodam epistularum loco una eademque esse videtur, Apollinaris, Sidonii filii, ut Th. Mommsenus³ arbitratus est, fortassis gemella. Hinc explicatur proluxa rosae descriptio vv. 14-26 *Perv. Ven.* Altera adnominatio 'alites' vv. 3 et 84, qui iuxta ponendi sunt, respicit Alathium (quo de etiam in Sidonii epistulis, istius Rosciae novum maritum, generum Sidonii. Hic proprio cognomine audivit Alcimus, fuitque perprobabiliter patria Burdigalensis.⁴ Pro explorato utique est Rosciam Alcimo nupsisse; Gregorius enim Turonensis sororem Apollinaris, Sidonii filii, Alcimam (consuetudinem nostri aevi praecoccupans) appellat.⁵ Praeterea stilus

¹ Vd. huius ad Sidonii opera (Mon. Germ. Histor. Auct. antiq. vol. viii.) praefationem, p. xlix.

² Cf. Auson. xvi, 3 et vd. indicem nominum in edit. Sidon. opp. P. Mohri (Lipsiae, 1895), p. 356, s.v. Alcimus.

³ Histor. Francor. iii. 2. 12; Glor. marty. c. lxiv. vd. indicem, p. 385 s.v. Roscia.

¹ Vd. Anthol. latin. i.² A. Riesii, praef. pp. xxxvi. sq.

² Vd. G. H. Heidtmanni De carm. lat. q. P. V. inscrib. dissertationem, Gryphiae, 1842, pp. 31 sq.

Aristo-
Lug-
Fl.
Essai
l'As-
190
Aristo-
Pari-

THERE
notice
genera-
volume
certain
kind t
adopt.
th-m
lâçer
av èpi-

ac sermo *Perv. Ven.* apprime conveniunt stilo ac sermoni Sidonii, prout id nos docent eius carmina atque epistulae; quod ipse, plurimis locis similibus conlatis, extra dubitationem omnem posui.¹ Est igitur *Perv. Ven.* carmen nuptiale, sive (minus apta locutione) epithalamium, in nuptias Rosciae Severianae,² Sidonii filiae, et Alethii Alcimi, celebratas Avitaci³ kalendis aprilibus anni 476.

Nepotis autem, quamquam omni potestate despoliati ac profugi, nomen facit Sidonius honorifice, cum quia illum summopere colebat,⁴ tum beneficiorum in suos ab eodem conlatorum memor.⁵ Nec, cum tunc temporis Fortunae mutationes occisime verterentur, absonum ei fuit credere vel sperare summam imperii brevi rursus Nepotem recuperaturum fore. Sensus maeroris, quo poetam esse detentum vv. 89–92 ostendunt,

¹ Iudicium de Sidonii scribendi genere severius vid. in egregio S. Dillii opere 'Rom. Society in the last cent. of the west. emp.'² Londini. 1899, pp. 448 sq.

² Duplex nomen mulieres quoque, inde a Julia Agrippina, insignivisse non pauca testantur exempla e.g. ex Historia Augusta. Itaque Ausonii sorores.

³ Cf. carmen cum epp. ii. 2, 3 sqq. ubi Avitacum describitur. Pro Hybla vv. 51 et 52 reponendum est Villa; pro Hyblaeis v. 49 villicis vel villar'bus cum vocalis syncope.

⁴ Cf. epp. viii. 7, 4.

⁵ Cf. epp. v. 16, 2.

causam Sidonii vitae vicissitudines aperiunt. Etenim, paullo antea ex Gallo-romano Vese-gotha factus, vix tunc '*moram moenium Livianorum*'⁶ et Eurici regis aulam, qua contemptim habitus fuerat, reliquerat. Quod vero epp. ix, 12, 1 ipse fateatur: *ab exordio religiosae professionis huic* (artis poeticae) *principaliter exercitio renuntiavi*—licet hoc cum *αἰθερία Perv. Ven.* conciliare ita ut Sidonius carmen familiarem eventum celebraturum germanum ac proprium magnique ponderis Musarum fetum non existimaverit; certe neque ipsemet umquam edidit nec suis operibus interseruit. Denique, quod et christianus et episcopus in poetico opusculo, in nuptiali carmine, Venerem concelebrat,⁷ admirari nolent ii qui recordentur deos deasque gentilium ne nostra quidem aetate e poeteseos campis emigrasse; ac dissidium inter litteras ad mentis culturam in totum ethnicas et habitum christianae religionis omnes eruditos Medii Aevi homines majori minorive molestia adfixisse.

L. RAQUETTIUS.

⁶ Epp. viii. 3, 1.

⁷ 'Down to the end of the century [and after, nam Innocentius episcopus Ticinensis eo non abstinuit], marriages in Christian families were still celebrated by an epithalamium in the old pagan manner. Sidonius has left two of these pieces, in which his taste is probably seen at his worst.' S. Dill. o. c. p. 446.

REVIEWS.

SOME RECENT WORKS ON ARISTOPHANES.

Aristophanis Plutus. Ed. J. VAN LEEUWEN. Lugd. Bat. 1904. Pp. xxvi. + 182. Fl. 2.90.

Essai sur la composition des comédies d'Aristophane. Par PAUL MAZON. Paris, 1904. Pp. 181. 4 fr.

Aristophane. La Paix. Par PAUL MAZON. Paris, 1904. Pp. 119. 4 fr.

THERE is not much that requires special notice in Mr. van Leeuwen's *Plutus*. In general execution resembling the earlier volumes of his *Aristophanes*, it presents certain changes in the text, some of a bolder kind than most editors would venture to adopt. I will give the most noticeable of them 115 ἀπαλλάξας . . . ποιήσεν for ἀπαλλάξεν ποιήσας: 119 ὁ Ζεὺς μὲν οὖν τάχιστα ἂν ἐπιτρέψειε με, ὦ μῶρ', ἐπεὶ πύθοιο

for ὁ Ζεὺς μὲν οὖν εἰδὼς τὰ τοῦτων μῶρ' ἔμ' εἰ πύθοιτ' ἂν ἐπιτρέψειεν: 267 ψωρόν (Herwerden) for ψωλόν: 368 ἀλλ' ἔστ' ἐπιθῆλον ὥς τι πεπανουργηκός: 631 πρὸ τοῦ for σαντοῦ: 727 γέροντι (Kappayne) for Πλούτωνι: 891 εἴθ' ἐπ' ἀγαθῶ πᾶσιν for ὥς δὴ π' ἀληθείᾳ: 969 ὄντως for εἶναι: 1036 διελεύσεως ἂν (Kappayne) for ἐμὲ γ' ἂν διελεύσαις: 1130 ὧν κατεβρόχθιζον τότε for ὧν ἐγὼ κατήσθιον. Between 770 and 771 he inserts 782–788 with a line of his own added at the end. The verse given in the MSS after 805, but usually omitted by editors, he has placed after 818, and 897 between 957 and 958. 1028–30 he has cut down by changes to two lines. It will be seen that some of these innovations require a good deal of defending—more, perhaps, than they can receive in a short note—and

can indeed, however wrong we may think the text, hardly be justified. Nothing but great real or supposed probability can justify an editor in actually introducing something into his text. Let him quarrel with the traditional text in a note as much as he pleases. Let him suggest by all means the kind of thing he supposes that his author may have said. But he ought not to make an actual change unless he feels pretty sure that he can restore the actual word or words, and Mr. van Leeuwen would hardly say that in some of these cases he feels that.

It has usually been held, on the ground of tradition, that our *Plutus* is a revised version, dating from some twenty years after the first appearance of the play. This tradition the present editor rejects, maintaining that matter and language alike point to 389 as the time of composition, and that there is nothing to suggest different dates for different parts. Certainly the weakness of the play and the general nature of it agree better with the later date. It is difficult to think it earlier than the *Frogs*, as according to tradition it must in substance have been. The tradition cannot however be traced up beyond a time many centuries after the poet's death.

Mr. Mazon's *Essai* is an interesting and fairly readable book, inspired by Zielinski's *Gliederung der altattischen Komödie*. But, though it adopts the main lines of Zielinski's work, its object is not only to supplement, but in some respects to correct Zielinski's conclusions. In one way he argues for more liberty than Zielinski allowed, in another for more regularity.

'En réalité,' he writes, 'il y a à la fois une certaine *liberté* dans les cadres eux-mêmes et un certain *ordre* dans la façon dont ils se succèdent. En d'autres termes, la comédie grecque est faite d'une succession régulière de cadres souples et non d'une succession incohérente de cadres rigides.'

After some preliminary remarks ('postulates et définitions') he goes through the eleven plays in turn, carefully analysing their structure and making many remarks of interest on a number of points. The last chapter generalises what has been observed in detail and lays down what he conceives to be the principles always or almost always followed in an Aristophanic comedy. Readers of Zielinski will recognise a good deal as coming from him, but he is so little known at present in England that I cannot do better than summarise them almost in Mazon's own words.

Every comedy has a prologue of three parts: (1) some comic 'business,' followed by (2) jocose lines which begin the spoken part of the play, and then (3) by the entrance on the action properly so-called. This entrance on the action made, comes the second part of the play, the *πάρσος*, or appearance of the chorus and the scene, always of some length, which follows it. It assumes very various forms and is couched in very various metres, but yet exhibits a certain regularity of presentation. The chorus is almost always in halves. After the *parodos* the agon or contest, on which Zielinski lays such stress: and this is not dialectical only, an argument *pro* and *contra* (e.g. that in the *Wasps* on the *dicasteria*), as Zielinski maintained, but also sometimes involves a real conflict of physical force; sometimes one succeeds the other, e.g. in the *Birds*, and we get both a battle and a debate. Then comes usually a short iambic scene, which terminates the first half of the play and points to the second which will begin after the *parabasis*. This first half is essential and original, the second of subsequent growth and often much less an integral part. The *parabasis* Mr. Mazon holds—perhaps not quite consistently—to have come always in the middle, never, as Zielinski says it once did, at the end, nor at the beginning. The second part of the play consists always of a series of scenes divided by choric (such as we never find in the first part) and these scenes are not unfrequently parallel in pairs, e.g. the two scenes of the Megarian and the Boeotian in the *Acharnians*. The chorus is an actor in the first part of the play, only a spectator in the second. The second *parabasis*, when found, is only an *intermezzo*. The *exodos*, last scene and exit of chorus and actors, is always of the nature of a *κῶμος*. Comedy originated in the agon, as an imitation of the conflicts of one kind or another connected with real *κῶμοι*, and the looser scenes developed out of this as a pendant.

No doubt there is much truth in this general account of the structure of Old Comedy. But there are many details in particular plays which it is hard to fit into this framework, as Mazon himself has to admit. He has to ask, for instance, on *Peace* 603 foll. whether a simple dialogue can constitute an agon, and he is actually forced to describe the iambic dialogue beginning there at 658 as an *antepirrhema*, and to give the name of *parabasis* to *Lysist.* 614–705, which is part of the regular course of the play and has nothing of the *parabasis*

about it. It is safer, I think, to say, as did Mr. Mazon's eminent countryman, H. Weil, in a review of Zielinski's book in the *Journal des Savants* (since reprinted in a volume of his *Études*) that we must allow more liberty and variety to have existed and that what Aristophanes did very often he was not obliged to do always. Mazon does not indeed have recourse to Zielinski's violent hypotheses as to changes that have been made in the comedies and have obscured their original outlines, and he grants more liberty of construction to the poet, but not enough to preclude the necessity of explaining away some things in a very unsatisfactory manner.

But the general thesis of the book is important and well argued, and many incidental points made in it deserve attention. It may therefore certainly be recommended to students of Aristophanes.

The same scholar's edition of the *Peace* does not aim at being more than a school-book. It has a good introduction and short

notes, shorter and fewer than those in the familiar school editions of Dr. Merry, to whom he expresses his obligations, as he does also in a marked manner to Dr. Blaydes. There is nothing, I think, novel in the way of readings, unless it be that he gives the whole of 834-837 to Trygaeus, reading καὶ τίς γε (τίς enclitic), and elsewhere has some similar redivisions. We may doubt whether he is right in making μεμφόμενον (924) passive and = μεμπτόν, or in taking ἕτερον δ' ἐτέρῳ (940) together in the tragic construction of the dative. His adherence to ἔως . . . λάθης (32) and μὴ . . . ὀρχήσεσθε (329) is too conservative, and in the notes on 21 and 49 his Greek is not faultless. It may be worth mentioning that in his opinion the actors were in the orchestra (as he says also in the other book, following Dörpfeld) and the entire action took place there, Trygaeus being lowered into it again at 172; and that he disbelieves in any second edition of the play.

H. RICHARDS.

EDMONDS' AND AUSTEN'S CHARACTERS OF THEOPHRASTUS.

The Characters of Theophrastus. Edited by J. M. EDMONDS, M.A., and G. E. V. AUSTEN, M.A. With Illustrations. Blackie and Son, 1904. Pp. xi + 171. 4s. 6d.

If there is any meaning left in the hackneyed phrase about a 'felt want,' it might surely have been adopted by Messrs Edmonds and Austen to justify their excellent edition. It is thirty-five years since Prof. Jebb published his well-known work, and since then the Sixth Form master, in whose armoury the *Characters* are an incomparable weapon, has had to content himself with the almost illegible and wholly untranslatable Tauchnitz text. We are peculiarly grateful then for this new edition, which seems in all respects well suited to its purpose. The introduction is sufficient to explain the nature of Theophrastus' work and the circumstances in which it took its shape; the text is readable and not overburdened with notes; the illustrations, indispensable to the modern school-book, are judiciously selected; and last, but not least, a useful 'Sachregister' is appended.

With regard to the original form of the book, the editors preserve an open mind, though they incline to Jebb's view of the

separate and intermittent production of the *Characters*. The text, which omits the poem and the spurious additions, differs from Jebb's in about 200 places, and follows almost uniformly the Leipzig edition of the Philologische Gesellschaft, to which the editors acknowledge their indebtedness throughout the book. It might indeed have been better to indicate that the reading συνδιουκῶν αἰρήσασθαι in xxi. 39 and the insertion of παραινέιν in xxvii. 20 are also derived from the same source: the notes, by an oversight, do not make this clear. Perhaps the editors have sometimes followed their guides too slavishly. In xxii. 1 they even adopt Holland's reckless change περιουσία τις φιλοχρηματίας ἀπὸ ἀφιλοτιμίας δαπάνην ἐλλείπουσα. What can δαπάνην ἐλλείπουσα mean? The editors courageously translate 'which shuns expense.' While he was about it, Holland might have inserted πρὸς before δαπάνην. What is one more change among so many?

Nothing is easier than to overweight Theophrastus with commentary. The editors are to be congratulated on the restraint which they have shown. If occasionally their notes contain unnecessary matter, any one will forgive them who reflects what

might have been done, for instance, by an enthusiastic anthropologist to illustrate *δεισιδαιμονία*.

Having said so much in praise, we may venture to point out one or two slight blemishes. In iv. 24, if *ἄμα* is kept, which Jebb found an insuperable difficulty, it should be explained that it must be taken as corresponding to the following *καί*. The critical note on xi. 22 is not quite correct. On xvi. 21 more might have been added to justify the reading and the interpretation. It is the Munich Epitome that makes it clear that the days are both unlucky and the rites apotropaic. Is anything gained in xvi. 27 by joining *τελειθροσόμενος πρὸς τοὺς Ὀρφεοτελεστάς* to the previous clause? A monthly initiation is awkward, but not

more so than an initiation 'whenever he has a dream,' which might occur even more frequently. The passive participle may serve as a middle. We observe that Miss Harrison (*Prolegomena*, p. 517) finds no difficulty in the ordinary interpretation. The notes on xvii. 14 and xxvi. 20 would seem to imply that 500 was the invariable number of an Athenian jury; while the note on xxiii. 10 is inconsistent with that on xiii. 9. On xxx. 9, Dem. *F. L.* 158 implies, but does not mention, 1 drachma as *ἐφόδιον*; and on xxviii. 8, Byron's *Maid of Athens* does not illustrate the use of *ψυχή* as a term of endearment. The care of the editors has extended to the proofsheets, and the book is remarkably free from misprints.

J. H. VINCE.

BRIEFER NOTICES.

Beiträge zur genaueren Kenntnis der attischen Gerichtssprache, aus den zehn Rednern. Von KONRAD SCHODORF. (Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache herausgegeben von M. v. SCHANZ, Heft 17.) Würzburg, 1905. Pp. 114.

AT first sight this discussion of the most important technical words of Attic jurisprudence, being devoted chiefly to terminology—the terminology in contests for inheritance, in connexion with the acts of adoption, of marriage, etc.—seems hardly in place in the well-known series of Contributions to Historical Syntax, but the author discusses the syntactic as well as the juristic usage of these words. *E.g.* he explains the familiar 'genitive of cause with verbs of judicial action' as derived from an original *διώκω τὴν ἱεροσυλίαν τοῦ δέινος*, or the like, which by an 'interchange of cases' became *διώκω τῆς ἱεροσυλίας τὸν δέινος*, and from this genitive with *διώκω* is explained that with *ἀμφισβητεῖν* and similar verbs. Analogy with *ἐπιμελεῖσθαι* is made to explain also the rare genitive with *ἐπιτροπεύω*, although this genitive is easily construed with the *ἐπίτροπος* contained in *ἐπιτροπεύω*. That the author should speak of *tnesis* in *καθ' οὗ μαρτυροῦσι*, seems rather old-fashioned.

The list of words examined does not aim to be complete, but perhaps no other publication is more convenient to have at hand in reading the forensic speeches of the Attic orators. In some details the author does not

adopt the ordinary view. Probably he does not derive from extant orations his statement that *διαμαρτυρία* means 'eine Einrede ... bei der beide Parteien [*italics* are his] ... Einspruch erheben, der Beklagte, dass die Einführung eines Processes nicht zulässig sei, der Kläger, dass sie es sei' (p. 81). Curiously he assigns the care of the clepsydra and the ballots to officials (*Beamte, Unterbeamter Diener*, pp. 30, 105, 107), although Aristotle clearly declares these services to be rendered by members of the court, chosen by lot. To refer to Photius, Suidas, and Pollux, instead of to Aristotle, for the *ἐφύδιον*, seems odd, too; and to say that no definite statements can be made with regard to the time allowed for speeches, without at least a reference to Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens*, page xxxiii, and to Keil's discussion in *Anonymus Argentinensis*, 236 ff., seems to indicate unfamiliarity with the literature of the subject.

T. D. S.

Appendix Lexici Graeci Suppletorii et Dialectici. Scripsit H. VAN HERWERDEN. Lugduni Batavorum. Apud A. W. Sijthoff. 1904. Pp. vi+262. 10 m.

THE *Lexicon Suppletorium et Dialecticum* has already been noticed in these pages. Since the date of its publication in 1902, new material has been published, and more continues to come forth, so that occasional

supplements are a necessity. We may grumble at the necessity, but can only be grateful for the supplement. The compiler has added also a large number of references which do not come under the head of new material, but had escaped his notice before. In this volume are included the word-store of Timotheos, the Tebtunis and Cairo Papyri, Nicoli's collection of Papyri, the third and fourth volumes of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, with a few others; and use has been made of the third edition of Meisterhans, Rutherford's *New Phrynichus*, Thumb's Hellenistic *Griechischen Sprache*, and more fully of Meister's *Griechische Dialekte*. The work is indispensable.

W. H. D. R.

Cornelii Taciti Historiarum Liber III.
Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Index, by W. C. SUMMERS, M.A. 1904.
University Press, Cambridge. Pp. xxii + 160. Price 2s. 6d.

ANOTHER of the small, cheap, and useful instalments of the classic writers for which the Pitt Press Series is honourably noted. Mr. Summers has produced a little edition for which both boys who have to read Book III of the Histories and their masters who wish to complete their reading of that most impressive work will be thankful. The introduction is especially noticeable because of

its bright and distinct sketch of Silver Age Latinity. Short as it is, it yet finds room for clear and telling illustrations from other authors as well as Tacitus, notably from Seneca; and, if the student will take the trouble to work these out, it will be much to his advantage. The other half of the Introduction is a Historical Summary of the events which from B.C. 44 led up to what is told us in this one book by Tacitus. Some of the sequel also is given in a final note: so that the main events are not at all left isolated. The analysis of the history is brief and business-like: but it is surely an oversight to say that Nero was caught in the country-house of one his freedmen and put to death.

The text used is Halm's, with few variations.

The notes are good, but err, if anything, on the side of fewness. There is a handy special note on the army. But, after some experience in teaching the Histories, I am convinced that if more than the mere Latin is to be learned, one of the most useful appendices which could be given to students working for an examination would be a brief and probably a tabular statement of which side each legion fought for in the campaigns of 68-69, and of which emperor or pretender was served by each distinguished officer.

F. T. R.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE IMPERATIVE IN ST. JOHN XX. 17.

IN connexion with the articles in your number for February last on the Greek present imperative let me call attention to St. John xx. 17 where Jesus says to Mary Magdalene μή μου ἄπτοι, οὐπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. I have long thought that a great deal of mystical interpretation has sprung from misunderstanding the present imperative and comparing ἄπτοι with ἐγγύω. What Jesus says is 'do not keep

clinging to me, i.e. you need not cling to me, for I have not yet ascended to my father, i.e. I am still here on earth and the time for ascension is not yet come.' I presume that Mary Magdalene had clung to his dress or feet.

H. J. ROBY.

LANCRIGG, GRASMERE.
17 April, 1905.

REPORT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.—HILARY TERM, 1905.

ON February 3rd Mr. POWELL read notes on the following passages of Sophocles:—

Trach. 116. May *ρέπει* be suggested here for *τρέφει*, in a transitive sense? Cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 405 and *ἐπιτρέπω* and *κατατρέπω*.

Oed. Col. 1453. Again *ρέπει*, transitive, for *ἐπέλ*? The sentence is broken off with *ἐκτενεν αἰθέρ*, *ὦ Ζεῦ* in 1456. Cf. a possible recollection of the passage, both in sentiment and construction, Eur. *frag. Bellerophon*, 306 Nauck (*Dindorf. frag. Bellerophon*, 24) *ποῦ δὲ κ.τ.λ.*

Electra 709. Perhaps *θεὶ σφᾶς*.

Antig. 211. Perhaps *σοὶ ταῦν* *ἀρέσκει* *δρᾶν*, *Μενεικέως Κρέον*. For the genitive, cf. *Aj.* 172, 1302; *Iliad* 2. 527; Kühner ii. 1. 333.

Oed. Rex 1264. Perhaps *τεταργανωμένην*: vid. Hesych., cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 789; *Lycophron* 748. Then correct and repunctuate thus:

οὐ δὴ κρεμαστὴν τὴν γυναικ' ἐσείδομεν
πλεκταῖς ἐάραις: ὁ δὲ, τεταργανωμένην
ῥωπας ὀρεῖ νιν, κ.τ.λ.

Oed. Rex 1031. Perhaps *τί δ' ἄλλος ἴσχωρ ἐν Κιθαιρώνας πτυχαῖς*; *Καιροῖς* of L is an example of word-mutilation, of which a conspicuous instance is seen in *Oed. Rex* 896 *πονεῖν ἡ τοῖς θεοῖς*, and 134. The Laurentian MS. seems prone to this: *Phil.* 1407, *El.* 856, *Trach.* 98, al. For confusion between *ο* and *ω* (*ἴσχωρ* and *ἴσχωω*) in this MS., exx. in Weeklein, *Ars Soph. Emend.* 54. For the contemptuous repetition of phrases (see 1026), a characteristic of Oedipus, cf. *Oed. Rex* 341 and 342; 344 and 345; 337 and 339; 358 and 359; 444 and 445; 575 and 576; 547 to 550 (*bis*).

Oed. Col. 1323. Perhaps *του* for *τοῦ*.

Ajax 1141. Perhaps *ἐν ἀντακούσει*. The apparent difficulty of the two accusatives is explained by the double correspondence thus given to the form of the previous line. *ἀλλά* in L comes from ditto-graphy.

Frag. 587. 5. Dindorf. Perhaps *σταθεῖσα*. 'Stops, and reflected by the river-water, sees.' Connect *ποτῶν* and *ὑπό*.

Vita Sophoclis in Dindorf,⁸ p. 12, line 66. Perhaps

εἰ μὲν γὰρ εἰμι Σοφοκλῆς, οὐ παραφρονῶ.

The suggestion of Prof. Jebb in *Soph. O.C.* preface, pp. xl. + xli. n. *παραφρονοῦμ' ἂν οὐ*, is hard to accept, because of this form of the optative.

On February 10th Mr. HADOW read a paper entitled 'Some remarks on Aristotle's theory of ἀκολασία.' In *N.E.* Bk. III. is sketched the gradual degeneracy of the character under the influence of bodily indulgences. At first the desires are not incapable of control, but *ἡ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἐνέργεια αἰετὶ τὸ συγγενές* (III. xii. 7) and resistance becomes more and more difficult until at last the state is like a bodily disease which cannot be shaken off: *τότε μὲν οὖν ἐξῆν αὐτῷ μὴ νοσεῖν προμύνην δὲ οὐκέτι ὥσπερ οὐδ' ἀφῆντι λίθον ἔτ' αὐτὸν δυνατόν ἀναλαβεῖν . . . Οὕτω καὶ τῷ ἀδίκῳ καὶ τῷ ἀκολάστῳ ἐξ ἀρχῆς μὲν ἐξῆν τοιοῦτοις μὴ γενέσθαι . . . γενομένοις δὲ οὐκέτι ἔξεστι μὴ εἶναι* (III. v. 14, cf. *ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρρωστίων* III. v. 22). The implication is that, when a certain

stage of vice has been reached, the power of rational direction becomes atrophied, the man has no longer any reasonable purpose but *ἀγεται ὑπὸ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας* which, we are told in *N.E.* III. ii. 5 *προαιρέσει ἐναντιοῦται*. Such cases, attested by the pathological accounts of the influence of drink or opium, seem to be wholly incompatible with *προαίρεσις* which is *μετὰ λόγον καὶ διανοίας* (III. ii. 17), and which is a *βουλευτική δρεῖς* (III. iii. 19). Cf. *ἡ ὀρεκτικὴ νοῦς ἡ δρεῖς διανοητική* (VI. ii. 5).

Again in *N.E.* III. xi. 5-6 there is a distinctive statement as to the part played by *λύπη* in the life of the ἀκόλαστος. The mark of ἀκολασία is not refusal or inability to bear pain, but the excessive pain felt when the craving for pleasure is not satisfied: *οὐχ ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀνδρείας τῷ ὑπομένειν λέγεται σάφρωι, ἀκόλαστος δὲ τῷ μὴ, ἀλλ' ὁ ἀκόλαστος τῷ λυπεῖσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ ὅτι τῶν ἡδέων οὐ τυγχάνει*. This again is precisely attested by the pathological evidence: so that in two important respects (perhaps the two most important) the account of Bk. III. gives a true psychological analysis.

Both these are contradicted by the account in Bk. VII. (a) The ἀκόλαστος ἀγεται *προαιρούμενος, οἰόμενος δεῖν τὸ παρὸν ἡδὺ δῶκεν* (VII. iii. 2, a very strong statement): he *διδίκε* *τὰς ὑπερβολὰς τῶν ἡδέων ἢ ὑπερβολαὶ καὶ διὰ προαίρεσιν* (VII. vii. 2): he does not even need any strong desire (*μὴ ἐπιθυμῶν ἢ ἥρεμα* VII. vii. 3): he acts *πεισιμένους διὰ τὸ τοιοῦτος εἶναι* (VII. viii. 4) and once more he pursues pleasure *οἰόμενος δεῖν* (VII. 9. 7). (b) We read in VII. vii. 3 *ὁμοίως (ἀκόλαστος ἐστίν) ὁ φεύγων τὰς σωματικὰς λύπας μὴ δὲ ἔτταν ἀλλὰ διὰ προαίρεσιν*: and even if we accept the interpretation of *μαλακίας εἶδος* (an interpretation which I venture to regard as extremely doubtful) this does not reconcile the contradiction, for the only allusion to *μαλακία* in *N.E.* III. treats it as a form of cowardice (III. vii. 13). Thus the ἀκόλαστος of Bk. VII. is deliberate, strong willed, intentional, pursuing his excesses not under stress of appetite but *οἰόμενος δεῖν*. His view of the ἀρχή is distorted (*διαστρέφει ἡ μοχθηρία καὶ διαφένδεσθαι ποιεῖ περὶ τὰς πρακτικὰς ἀρχάς*, VI. xii. 10), but he holds to it with entire and whole souled conviction. It may be doubted whether such a character is psychologically possible: at any rate it is totally different from that described under the same name in *N.E.* III.

The explanation of this discrepancy must in any case be conjectural; but it may be worth noting (1) that from the account of ἀκολασία in *E.E.* III. ii. all the distinctive points quoted from *N.E.* III. v. and xii. are omitted, (2) that the account in *E.E.* III. ii. does not seem to be incompatible with *προαίρεσις*, (3) that it promises a completion of the sketch *ἐν τοῖς λεγομένοις ὑστερον περὶ ἐγκρατείας καὶ ἀκρασίας* (*E.E.* III. ii. 18), a promise to which there is no parallel in *N.E.* III., (4) that in style and phraseology the chapters of Bk. VII. have more affinity to the early Eudemian than to the early Nicomachean books.

On February 17th Mr. WARDE FOWLER read a paper on 'A new fragment of the *Laudatio Turinæ*.' [The paper will be published in the *Classical Review*.]

On February 24th Mr. CLARK read a paper on 'Zielinski's discovery of the metrical law regulating the Ciceronian *clausula*.' [The paper has been published in the April number of the *Classical Review*.]

On March 3rd Mr. ROSS read a paper on 'The structure of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.' [The paper will be published in full.]

On March 10th Mr. BEASLEY read a paper on 'The *kúrios* of the woman at Athens and elsewhere.' The paper dealt with three main questions: (i) the prevalence of the *kúrios* in Greece, (ii) the person upon whom the office devolved, (iii) the variations in the functions of the *kúrios* and the causes for those variations. As to the first point, the texts alleged in support of the theory that at Athens the consent of the *kúrios* was not a necessary condition of the formation of a contract by a woman, are barely worth the refutation given them by Beauchet. That the *kúrios* was found all over Greece, assisting in all manner of contracts, is shown by the inscriptions. But of these contracts there are two classes in which the woman is not assisted by a *kúrios*—manumissions and religious foundations. Of this divergence Foucart has given the most satisfactory explanation, viz. that they were either actually or originally to the profit of a religious corporation. The only state of which the existence of the *kúrios* in the full sense of the word can be denied is Gortyn.

As to the person upon whom the charge devolved: so far as Athens is concerned, by the most satisfactory interpretation of the law cited in Dem. c. *Steph.* ii. 18 (1134), in cases where neither father, nor brother, nor grandfather is alive, the unmarried woman, who is not *ἐπίκληρος*, does not fall under the power of her nearest *ἀγχιστεὺς* but is assigned a *kúrios* by the archon.

In the case of the married woman, the view of Hruza that the husband is not as such necessarily *kúrios* must be adopted, though at variance with that of the overwhelming majority of writers on Greek law, who seem for the most part to have accepted a tradition without inquiring into the soundness of its foundations. For Greece other than Attica we have no definite statement of the law, but there is nothing to show that it varied from the Athenian, if the views stated above be accepted. Not only is there no proof that the husband was as such *kúrios*, but there is even proof that he was not.

As to divergence of character in the functions of the *kúrios*, it may be said that at Athens the *kúrios* is the 'lord' of the woman, elsewhere he is rather the 'ratifier' of her acts; and this difference in the woman's position is due to the difference in the law of inheritance, a difference marked also by the prevalence of *θυγατροποιία* in the islands and Asiatic Greece.

A. H. J. GREENIDGE,
Hon. Sec.

VERSION.

SONG.

TO THE EVENING STAR.

Star that bringest home the bee,
And sett'st the weary labourer free!
If any star shed peace, 'tis thou,
That send'st it from above,
Appearing when heaven's breath and brow
Are sweet as hers we love.

Come to the luxuriant skies,
Whilst the landscape's odours rise,
While far-off lowing herds are heard,
And songs when toil is done,
From cottages whose smoke unstirred
Curls yellow in the sun.

Star of love's soft interviews,
Parted lovers on thee muse;
Their remembrancer in Heaven
Of thrilling vows thou art,
Too delicious to be riven
By absence from the heart.

T. CAMPBELL.

O qui duces apes domum
Fessosque agricolas, Hespere, liberas,
Tranquillissime siderum,
Tu, tu das requiem, grata silentia
Tu stillas, simul ac polo
Nigrescente procul uisus es: haud secus
Tum fragrat Notus ut genae
Formosae redolent oraque uirgini.
Iam caelum pete lucidum,
Vespertinus enim spirat ager, greges
Mugitus iterant procul,
Cantant ruricolae iam uacui, quibus
Fumosis natat aureo
Tinctus sole vapor plurimus e focis.
Tu, tu reddis amantibus
Horam compositam: te Corydon sua
Semotus procul a Chloë
Spectans a! meminit colloqui simul
Furtiui, meminit miser
Acceptae fidei non sine sauiis,
Qualem ne rabidi quidem
Fluctus Oceani dissociabiles
Fido pectore diluant,
Nec Lethes ualeant demere pocula.

R. QUIRK.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

PLATNER'S *ANCIENT ROME*.

The Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome. By SAMUEL BALL PLATNER. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1904. 8vo. Pp. xiv + 514. Eighty-nine Illustrations, nine Maps and Plans. Price \$3.

In this book Mr. Platner has brought Roman topography as nearly up to date as the subject, in the present state of archaeological activity in Rome, admits. His aim is to give in a compact form the best-attested results of the most recent investigations, and he has for the most part succeeded admirably. He shows an intimate acquaintance with the literature, sifts large masses of material with nice discrimination, and in deciding between conflicting views generally gives good reasons for the faith that is in him. His preface acknowledges indebtedness to Hülsen, Richter, Lanciani, Ashby, and other prominent investigators. To Richter his debt is especially large. The influence of the *Topographie der Stadt Rom* is manifest not only in the accounts given of many sites and monuments, but also in the general plan and arrangement of the material. The requirements of the series to which the book belongs precluded the possibility of any very lengthy exposition of the author's own views, and, as we should expect, the element of original matter is smaller than in Professor Richter's work. Mr. Platner's book is on the whole less suggestive. On the other hand, it is better balanced, safer, more reliable. Students will be grateful for the references given in foot-notes to ancient writers and to modern journal articles. These add materially to the value of the book, and there is no sign of that inaccuracy of citation which makes Richter's work so exceedingly treacherous as a book of reference.

After brief chapters on sources, general topography of Rome and the Campagna, building materials, etc., Mr. Platner gives an account of the development of the city (pp. 32-75). In the subsequent chapters the different regions of the city and their principal monuments are discussed. The author has done his best work in his treatment of the Palatine (chap. viii), the Forum (chap. ix), and the Imperial Fora (chap. x), although he himself complains of the unsatisfactory condition of the topography of

the Palatine (p. 127), and the problems presented by the Forum are more numerous and more intricate than in any other part of the city. A good feature of the book is the presence of such passages as that on pp. 52 ff., giving a general sketch of the appearance of the city at different periods of the Republic; the similar section on Rome during the Empire, pp. 70 ff.; the characterization of the population of the Velabrum, Forum Boarium (pp. 373 ff.), and Subura (p. 435); the account of the streets of the different parts of the city, the private houses, and the belts of gardens on the east, north, and west sides. These descriptions are invaluable in a book intended as an introduction to Roman topography, for they bring home to the reader, as nothing else could, the value and significance of the study of the subject. By means of them Mr. Platner has been able to vitalize his work. He shows Rome to us not as *disiecta membra*, but as something organic.

It remains to note points in which the treatment might have been improved, or in regard to which the author's conclusions may reasonably be questioned. For example, in the account of the Septimontium (p. 40) it is stated that Festus and Paulus Diaconus tell us that 'the seven *montes* were the three parts of the Palatine, Palatium, Cermalus, and Velia; the two spurs of the Esquiline, Oppius and Cispius; the northern spur of the Caelian, which was called Sucusa; and the Fagutal.' This is a somewhat heroic treatment of the two much-disputed passages (Fest. 348 M; Paul. Diac. 341 M), in which a list of eight *montes* is given. Moreover, the name Sucusa is not mentioned in either passage, and the brief statement that 'Sucusa was confused with Subura, and so appears in our sources,' hardly disposes of the difficulty in a satisfactory manner. Mr. Platner is here following Richter and Wisowa (*Satura Viadrina*), and contrary, it must be said, to his usual custom, has swallowed his authorities whole. Apart from these details, the theory that the Septimontium, as described, was the second stage in the city's development might well have been given a more detailed treatment than has been accorded to it. Mr. Platner has, to be sure, given the current view, and, if he is in error, errs in exceedingly good company. Yet this theory is based on extremely meagre evidence. It is certainly

not topographically 'inevitable' that the first extension of the Palatine city should have been towards the Esquiline, and not towards the Capitoline. Furthermore, the existence of the festival known as the Septimontium does not necessarily imply the political unity of the inhabitants of the different hills. The relation of the Capitoline to the early settlements is left in as unsatisfactory a condition as ever.

In his discussion of the Rostra (pp. 214 ff.) Mr. Platner takes the position that the existing remains of *opus quadratum* date back to the restoration of Trajan; but that the hemicycle behind belongs to the age of Severus. From his preface, however, it would seem that since writing this part of the book he has changed his opinion on the question of the relative date of these two monuments. For he expresses his regret (p. vi) that Richter's monograph *Die römische Rednerbühne*, 1903, reached him so late that he was not able to incorporate its conclusions in his text. In this monograph Richter, abandoning his old view, contends that the hemicycle is earlier than the present remains of the Rostra. He even goes so far as to state his belief that in the hemicycle we have the Rostra of Caesar. Whether Mr. Platner's conversion is as complete as Prof. Richter's, or whether he agrees with him only in giving the hemicycle an earlier date than the Rostra is left in doubt. Even in regard to the latter point it is curious that our author was not able to arrive at what certainly seems to be the natural conclusion without the aid of Richter's latest article. For the belief which Prof. Richter now professes has long been held by Nichols, Ashby, and others.

Mr. Platner is too good a topographer to be dogmatic in discussing the monuments beneath the *lapis niger*. The explanation that the pedestal group did represent the supposed tomb of Romulus or Faustulus seems to him to be 'the least open to objection.' On the question whether the cippus, cone, and platform had any connection with the pedestal group, he declines to commit himself. His most adventurous statement on this point is 'it may be that either the platform of the cippus or that just behind the pedestals belongs to the earliest Rostra of the Republic.' In dealing with the *lapis niger* itself he has unfortunately not shown the same caution. He gives with considerable confidence Hülsen's view (*Mitt.* 1902, 30-31) that the black pavement was laid at the time of the revival of the cult of Romulus in the reign of Maxentius; and it is, in

his opinion (p. 240), 'practically certain' that Maxentius laid it to reproduce the original *lapis niger* of the tomb of Romulus. The arguments which he adduces are anything but convincing, and it is difficult to understand how Mr. Platner can regard this section of pavement as an attempt to reproduce a monument which he is inclined to believe was 'a cone-shaped stone' (p. 239). Nor can the statement (p. 239) that 'its level and workmanship prove its late date' be accepted without demurrer. In his recent article on the different strata of the Comitium (*Jahreshefte des Oesterr. Arch. Instituts*, vi, 146 ff.), Studniczka places the *lapis niger* on the same level with the pavement of the Comitium of Caesar, and argues convincingly for the connection of the two. Mr. Ashby assigned it to this level as far back as 1900, *C.R.*, p. 237. Petersen in his book *Comitium, Rostra, Grab des Romulus*, 1904, is of the same opinion.

Excavations carried on during April of last year enable us to supplement the statement on p. 256 that 'the so-called lacus Curtius was probably somewhere in the middle of the area.' Remains that probably belong to it have been discovered about twenty yards to the northwest of the base of the statue of Domitian.

What are apparently misstatements occur here and there. For example, on p. 95 it is said that the Anio vetus entered the city *ad Spem veterem*, and followed the line of the Servian wall to the Porta Esquilina. A glance at the map will show the inaccuracy of this. On p. 124 we find the statement that the via Latina branched off to the right from the via Appia. The loose use of the terms north, south, etc. sometimes leads to inconsistencies. On p. 127 the Cermalus is described as being on the north of the Palatine hill, the Palatium proper on the south; yet on p. 33 we read that the term Palatium seems to have been applied to the settlement on the eastern half of the hill, while the western part was called Cermalus. On p. 40, in the description of the Fagutal, eastern seems to be a slip for western. The site is correctly described on p. 422.

In his incidental references to questions of Roman religion Mr. Platner is not so happy as on the purely topographical side. Far too little is known about Caca to justify her being called 'the goddess of the hearth and the fire' (p. 35), and it is certainly not 'quite probable' that she had a shrine near the southwest corner of the Palatine hill, and was displaced by Vesta. On p. 40 the author speaks as if Agonia or Agonalia

were a special title of the Septimontium, and not a generic term applied to more than one festival. On p. 51 we have perhaps the one passage in which Mr. Platner is completely abandoned by that sobriety of judgment which characterizes his work as a whole. For there is something almost oriental in the imagery of the paragraph in which he favours the theory that 'the Romans applied the name Janiculum to the ridge in the west, because Janus the Sun-god was seen each night to sink behind it, entering his own abode at the close of the day, just as the shepherds themselves entered their own city, the Palatium.' Of the many views advanced concerning Janus, that which regards him as a sun-god is the least likely, and it is indeed now generally discredited. Nor is there justification for the assertion on p. 45: 'the word Argei is evidently a Latinization of Ἀργεῖοι.' Where there is such divergence of opinion as there is on this point, it should at least be indicated. On p. 128 the shields of Mars are said to have been kept in the Curia Saliorum on the Palatine. They were, however, kept in the sacrum Martis in the Regia, as is correctly pointed out on p. 204. From the account given on p. 282 Mr. Platner apparently believes in the separate existence of a god Terminus at an early period of Roman religion. There is much more to be said in favour of Wissowa's theory that there was no independent cult of Terminus before imperial times, and that originally the boundary stones were under the protection of Jupiter Terminus. This being the case, the presence of the stone in the middle cell of the Capitoline temple had its own appropriateness. On the same page it is stated that the statue of Jupiter was 'clothed with the attire of a Roman triumphator.' It was the other way: the garb of the triumphator was modelled on that of the god. On p. 375 the casual reference to human sacrifices might lead one to suppose that these were of frequent occurrence among the Romans.

The illustrations are well chosen, some of the restorations being especially good, e.g. that of the Area Palatina, p. 143, and that of the Domus Flavia, p. 147. There are also a number of useful maps and plans, but many others might have been added with distinct advantage to the book, e.g. a map of the Campagna, showing the courses of the aqueducts; a map of the Campus Martius, and one of the Caelian. If the drains of the Forum merited the detailed description given on pp. 252-255, they certainly deserved a plan. Maps of ancient and of

modern Rome are given at the beginning and end of the volume, but they are on too small a scale to be satisfactory. Sites mentioned in the text cannot always be identified on them. The typographical work is excellent; I have noticed only one error: 'alerae' for 'Valeriae' on p. 488.

G. J. LAING.

University of Chicago.

PROFESSOR FURTWÄNGLER, AGE- LADAS AND STEPHANOS.¹

I ASK to be allowed to advert briefly to Professor Furtwängler's reply (*J.H.S.* xxiv. p. 336) to my strictures on his style of controversy. He would have his readers believe that my arguments were limited to *one point* (*ibid.* p. 336), and would have me assert that 'my (Furtwängler's) whole stylistic comparison, including the hypothesis suggested about Ageladas, was founded on a mistake in a drawing.' This is distinctly not the case. Every reader of my article will see that more space is devoted to other arguments of style than to the question of the false drawing—itsself of considerable importance. He now admits that the drawings are wrong; but here too he throws the blame on other shoulders—namely upon the artist who made them, Herr Max Lübke. Even if the artist working from photographs is the immediate cause of the mistakes in the drawings—made for purposes of stylistic comparison—this does not remove the responsibility of the archaeological writer who accepts them and bases conclusions upon them. Next he endeavours to show how the mistakes in the drawings do not affect the main points of his comparison, and makes this remarkable statement: 'The sole object of the drawing, as I distinctly stated in that place [the italics are mine], is to show clearly how the motif of the Ligurio bronze is related to the so-called Stephanos type.' It is hardly credible; but I am bound to state, that *there is not a word* to that effect in his publication of the fiftieth *Berliner Winckelmannsprogramm* to which he refers. What he does say, on the other hand (p. 137), in commenting on the points which the statues are supposed to have in common, is, that the drawings there given are capable of demonstrating his point more readily than words (*die beistehenden Skizzen vermögen dies rascher als*

¹ See *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xxiv. pp. 129-134.

Worte zu veranschaulichen). In this connexion he dwells upon points of proportion, width of chest, size of head, etc., etc., for several pages, and not only on the *motif* or scheme, by which I suppose he means the attitude and action.

Even if it were the attitude and action alone upon which he bases his comparison and his momentous conclusions, I defy any trained archaeologist not to see how strikingly different these are. I could indicate a number of statues and statuettes in which there is greater similarity of *motif* (without such great differences in other respects) on the one hand, to the Ligurio bronze, on the other to the Stephanus ephēbus, than these two works show between each other. *Motifs* of this kind, in the centuries that elapsed between the making of the Ligurio bronze and the Stephanus ephēbus, became so diversified, while in their respective periods themselves so many statues by different schools and artists had the same or similar attitudes, that no scientific conclusions of value can be based upon even greater similarity of *motif* than they possess. Moreover I consider the principle involved of such wide and fundamental importance for the general method of archaeological study, that I should like to give all possible emphasis to the following statement: It may be interesting and instructive in the early stages of the development of plastic art (the archaic and the transitional period), to pursue carefully the advance in freedom of *motif* and attitude. But when sculpture has passed beyond these elementary stages, a similarity of 'motif,' where there is not similarity of style — especially when the 'motif' is a simple, almost a universal one — is not of much use in establishing a relationship of school. This rule would strikingly apply to the case of the two works compared by Prof. Furtwängler even if there was greater similarity of motif between them.

Prof. Furtwängler ends his short article with an appeal to archaeological authority. 'Any one,' he says, 'who has made a serious attempt to grapple with the problem will agree with me.' I do not see how such an appeal helps argument and proof which both he and I ought to be able to produce without support of 'authority.' As he does so, I may say that I have received numerous letters from colleagues at home and abroad accepting my evidence against his; while the only publication which has appeared since this discussion has been before the public which is concerned in this

question is W. Klein's *Geschichte der Griechischen Kunst*, vol. i. (1904). On p. 385 this author distinctly rejects Furtwängler's view of Ageladas and Stephanos and accepts mine. His words are: *Aber noch weit weniger kann die Stephanosfigur mit Hagelaidas, dem sie derzeit zuversichtlich zugeschrieben wird, etwas zu thun haben. Gerade der Vergleich mit dem argivischen Ballspieler ergibt dies als sicheres Resultat.* The footnote to this passage runs: *Ihre richtige Beleuchtung erhält die Konstruktion Furtwänglers durch Waldstein im J.H.S. xxiv. (1904), p. 129 ff.*

CHARLES WALDSTEIN.

THE BRITISH SCHOOL AT ROME.

THE third open meeting of the British School at Rome was held in the Library of the School on Monday April 3. The chair was taken by Prof. H. F. Pelham, President of the Managing Committee of the School, and among those present at the meeting was the British Ambassador, Sir Edwin Egerton.

The Acting Director (Mr. T. Ashby, junr.) read a paper on Monte Circeo, the solitary promontory which is seen from the Alban Hills rising from an otherwise uniformly flat coastline. Tradition has identified it with the magic isle of Circe, and M. Bérard in his recent work, *Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssée*, fully accepts this identification, which he supports by the statement that *Alaión*, the name of the island of Circe, is the exact transcription of the Semitic equivalent for the island of the hawk (*κύρκος*).¹

The fact that the promontory is not an island, and apparently was only one long before any period to which the Homeric legend may be assigned, is no bar to the identification; for Procopius well remarks (*Bell. Goth.* i. 11) that it has the appearance of an island from a distance, whether seen from the land or from the sea.

The promontory next appears in the early history of Rome, when we hear of the foundation of the colony of Cercei (this is the older and better orthography according to Hülsen in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realenk.* iii. 2565), according to some authorities, in the time of Tarquinius Superbus, according to others, at the beginning of the fourth century B.C. It was at that time the frontier of the Roman dominion against the Volscians. The site of this colony is not certain: for, though upon the promontory itself there are considerable remains of Cyclopean walls,

¹ As to this and similar derivations see Prof. W. M. Ramsay's remarks in *C.R.* 1904, p. 168.

belonging undoubtedly to a fortified enclosure, this may or may not have been pre-Roman; and it seems clear, that, at any rate at the beginning of the Imperial period, the Roman town stood by the shores of the Lago di Paola, not on the promontory at all, but on the flat ground to the north-west of it. Considerable remains of it exist, though it seems to have been a place of subordinate importance; but the promontory was always, owing to the beauty of the scenery, a resort of the wealthier Romans, and several villas may be found upon it, though their owners cannot be identified. Mr. Ashby's paper will shortly appear in the *Mélanges de l'École Française*.

Mr. W. St. Clair Baddeley followed with a paper upon a large villa at the Colle di S. Stefano, to the south-east of the villa of Hadrian, of which it has been until recently considered to form a part.¹ A fragmentary inscription discovered by him (*Bull. Com.* 1899, 32) makes it extremely probable that it belonged to the Vibii or Plancii Vari; and it is certainly a distinct building, of considerable size and importance, though practically coeval with the villa of Hadrian.

A marble tablet, found close to the villa only a little while back, which Mr. Baddeley exhibited, bears the words

LVCV | SANCTV

The form and wording are alike remarkable, for *sacer* would be the more natural adjective; and the tablet must have served as a sign to mark the actual confines of the grove. An isolated building near to it may perhaps be the temple with which the sacred grove was connected.

Note.—It may be interesting to add that Baron Barracco's well known collection of classical sculptures, which have been presented by him to the city of Rome and placed in a museum specially constructed for it, is now open to the public.

MONTHLY RECORD.

ASIA MINOR.

Aphrodisias (Caria).—M. Paul Gaudin carried on excavations here in Aug.-Sept. 1904. The temple, a building of fine Ionic style, had been transformed into a Byzantine church, whose floor was paved with the

¹ Winnefeld (*Villa des Hadrian*, 24) does not agree with the ordinary view.

remains of ancient sarcophagi. Some interesting types were discovered. In the neighbourhood of the temple several architectural fragments from the Propylaea have been found. A frieze representing mounted Cupids, hunting-scenes, etc. deserves special mention. Near the Agora a building, which had previously been taken for a Basilica, proves to belong to public baths; excavations have brought to light fragments of the architectural decoration of the portico of the baths. Some of the sculptures found show a distinct relation to those of the Didymeion (ca. first century B.C.). On the site of the Gymnasium a frieze representing a Gigantomachy has been discovered. It formed the decoration of a fountain, and appears to be an imitation of the great frieze of the altar at Pergamum. It is of early Imperial date.¹

GREECE.

Delos.—The following is a short summary of the results of the excavations carried on by the French School from April to October, 1904. The gate giving access to the north-east part of the temenos of Apollo has been cleared, together with a staircase by which descent was made from the street behind. Exploration of the street situated east of the Peribolos led to the discovery of a stèle of white marble *in situ*. It is decorated with low reliefs on three of its sides. The subjects represented are of a Dionysiac character, and an epigram of two lines records a victory gained by an inhabitant of Delos in a Dionysiac contest. Near this monument two large statues of Silenos in white marble, a mutilated statue of Dionysos, and several Dionysiac symbols were discovered. All this would seem to show that there was a *τερόν* of Dionysos at this spot. At the western terrace of the temenos three archaic torsos ('Apollo' type), early vases, and other archaic objects have been found. North-west of the Agora a bilingual inscription of the second or first century B.C. has revealed the presence of a bathing establishment and, in particular, of a *laconicum*. The Agora itself was bordered by shops. One of these evidently belonged to a sculptor, for in it were found about thirty works of sculpture, for the most part only roughly sketched out, some statuettes, and some funeral stelae. About sixteen yards south of the Schola Romanorum is a large semi-circular enclosure of granite blocks. Against the convex wall are leant four stelae, on

¹ *Compte-rendu de l'Acad. des Inscr.*, Nov.-Dec 1904.

three of which is inscribed in large fifth century letters: ABATON—'no admittance.'

The building of the Syrian merchants of Berytos—the *Ποσειδωνιαστῶν*—has been entirely cleared. At the north-east angle is a large court surrounded by a portico of the Doric order. On the epistyle are engraved dedicatory inscriptions, the gift of benefactors of the society.

In the South Merchants' Quarter another warehouse has been excavated. The finds made here include a white marble banquet relief of the Alexandrian period and a large number of pottery fragments which range in date over all periods, beginning with the archaic. Another building appears to have formed part of a *συνουκία*.

Thanks to the work carried on in the neighbourhood of the theatre, it is now possible to form a fairly exact idea of the appearance of a Delian street and the more modest class of houses. The water supply was furnished by numerous wells which opened into the court of each house. One house, called the House of Dionysos from the large mosaic of Dionysos on a tiger, is the most spacious yet discovered in Delos. Eight rooms open on the court, and all have painted wall-decoration. This decoration is analogous to that of the 'first' style at Pompeii, but is of earlier date. Whereas the Pompeian house spread over a wide area, the Delian house developed in height.

Noteworthy finds were not numerous. A

torso of Poseidon in white marble, perhaps of the 4th cent. B.C., a marble statuette of a goddess seated on a cushioned arm-chair (2nd-1st cent. B.C.), and a female head in white marble may be mentioned. One hundred and seventy-four inscriptions were obtained. Among them are two decrees of the Island Confederacy, an Athenian decree in honour of the priests of Delos, and a double dedication of the Syrians of Berytos in honour of Antiochus VIII. and the people of Athens.¹

ITALY.

Rome.—As a result of excavations on the Clivus Palatinus, a pavement of basalt with slabs of travertine on either side has been discovered. This probably formed the foot-path. Excavations round the foundations of the Arch of Titus show that the Clivus ran below it in a slanting direction. This fact would seem to indicate that the Arch of Titus was moved to the present spot at some date subsequent to its original erection, unless indeed the pavement was covered at the time of Nero's building operations. In the angle formed by the Clivus Palatinus and the Nova Via are the remains of a building which Com. Boni considers to be the Aedes Larum in Summa Sacra Via.²

F. H. MARSHALL.

¹ *Compte-rendu de l'Acad. des Inscr.*, Nov.-Dec. 1904.

² *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1st April, 1905.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

American Journal of Philology. Vol. xxv. No. 4.

The Indo-Iranian Nasal Verbs, Edwin W. Fay. *The Authorship of the Greek Military Manual Attributed to Aeneas Tacticus*, T. Hudson Williams. *The Recession of the Latin Accent in connection with Monosyllabic Words and the Traditional Word-order*, R. S. Radford. *The Influence of the Infinitive upon Verbs Subordinated to it*, Tenny Frank. Reviews, etc.: Sandys' *History of Classical Scholarship from the Sixth Century B.C. to the end of the Middle Ages*, George L. Hamilton. Zielinski's *Das Clauselgesetz in Cicero's Reden*, Kirby Flower Smith. Murray Bradley and Craigie's *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, James M. Garnett. Summaries of Periodicals. Brief Mention: Diels' and Schubart's *Didymos*, Leo's *Festrede on the Originality of Roman Literature*, Butcher's *Harvard Lectures on Greek Subjects*, W. A. Merrill's *Latin Hymns*. Retrospect. Recent Publications, etc.

Revue de Philologie. Vol. 28, No. 4.

On the Fragments on Music attributed to Philolaos, Paul Tannery. *On the Declaimer Alpius Flavius*, H. de la Ville de Mirmont. *De Xenophontis Anabasi*, Mortimer Lamson Earle. Isocrates *Pan.* 149 alludes to *Anab.* 2. 4. 4. *On Plautus*, L. Havet. Emendations of unmetrical lines: *Men.* 219; *Merc.* 602; *Mil.* 790, 1168, 1402; *Most.* 1047, 1046 and 931; *Persa* 556, 566, 570-572, 630; *Poen.* 294, 309-311, 365-366 and 383-390, 370, 873, 921; *Pseud.* 614, 625, 734, 1174; *Rud.* 777-778, 1069, 1247; *Stich.* 75, 147, 293, 374, 376; *Trin.* 1059. *Metrologica*. *Unpublished Fragments of Florentinus*, Daniel Seruys. *A New Manuscript of Sedulius' opus paschale*, J. Candel. The MS. is No. 303 in the library at Orleans, and belongs to the tenth century. A collation is given. *On Aulularia* 156, Georges Romain. His emendation as proposed on p. 208 of the *Revue* has been anticipated by L. Havet, *Revue de Philologie*, 1887, p. 148. *Bulletin bibliographique*.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

The size of books is given in inches. 4 inches = 10 centimetres (roughly).

- Cicero.** Courbaud (Edmond) Oeuvres de Cicéron. De Oratore liber primus. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. lxxxviii + 217. Paris, Librairie Hachette et Cie. 1905. 7. 50 fr.
- Doebritz** (Rudolphus) De Artemidoro Strabonis, auctore capita tria *Dissertatio inauguralis*. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6". Lipsiae, Typis Roberti Noske Bornensis. 1905.
- Geffcken** (Johannes) Das griechische Drama. Aischylos, Sophokles, Euripides. Mit einem Plan des Theaters des Dionysos zu Athen. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 113. Leipzig und Berlin, Theodor Hofmann. 1904. M. 2.20.
- Georgius** (Monachus) Chronicon edidit C. de Boor. Vol. II. (*Bibl. Script. Gr. et Rom. Teub.*) 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 383-804 (and Pp. i-lxxxiv. of Band I.). Leipzig, Teubner. 1904. M. 10.
- Homer.** Zuretti (C. O.) Omero. L'Iliade. Vol. VI. Libri xxi-xxiv. (*Collezione di Classici Greci e Latini con note Italiane.*) 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xi + 212. Torino, Casa editrice Ermanno Loescher. 1905. 2. 40 lire.
- Hommel** (Dr. Fritz) Grundriss der Geographie und Geschichte des alten Orients. Erste Hälfte. Ethnologie des alten Orients. Babylonien und Chaldaea. (*I. von Müller. Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Band 3. Abt. 1. Hälfte 1.*) 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. vi + 400. München. Oskar Beck. M. 7.50.
- Lavisse** (Ernest) Histoire de France depuis les origines jusqu'à la révolution. Mariéjol (Jean H.) Tome vi. Henri IV. et Louis XIII. (1598-1643). 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 493. Paris, Librairie Hachette et Cie. 1905. 6 fr.
- Pascal** (L'Abbé André) Pierre Julien, Sculpteur (1731-1804). Sa vie et son oeuvre. 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 188. Paris, A. Fontemoing. 1904.
- Plessis** (Frédéric) Poésie latine. Épitaphes. (*Collection 'Minerva.'*) 8" x 5". Pp. lxii + 305. Paris, A. Fontemoing. 1905. 4 fr.
- Preuss** (Sigmundus) Index Isocrates. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 112. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1904. M. 8.
- Proclus** *Diadochus*. In Platonis Timaeum commentaria ed. E. Diehl. II. (*Bibl. Script. Graec. et Rom. Teubn.*) 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. vi + 334. Leipzig. 1904. M. 8.
- Rainfurt** (Dr. Adam) Zur Quellenkritik von Galens Protreptikos. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 60. Freiburg im Breisgau, B. Herder. 1905. M. 1.50.
- Sophocles.** Blaydes (Fredericus H. M., M.A., etc.) Sophoclis Antigone denno recensuit et breui annotatione critica instruxit F.H.M.B. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 104. Halis Saxonum in Orphanotrophei Libraria. 1905.
- Virgil.** Wetmore (Monroe Nichols, Ph. D.) The Plan and Scope of a Vergil Lexicon with Specimen Articles. (*A thesis presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Yale University in candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.*) 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 128. New Haven Conn. Published by the author. 1904.